arXiv:1302.6383v1 [math.AC] 26 Feb 2013

MODULE BORDER BASES

MARKUS KRIEGL

Abstract. In this paper, we generalize the notion of border bases of zero-dimensional polynomial ideals to the module setting. To this end, we introduce order modules as a generalization of order ideals and module border bases of submodules with finite codimension in a free module as a generalization of border bases of zero-dimensional ideals in the first part of this paper. In particular, we extend the division algorithm for border bases to the module setting, show the existence and uniqueness of module border bases, and characterize module border bases analogously like border bases via the special generation property, border form modules, rewrite rules, commuting matrices, and liftings of border syzygies. Furthermore, we deduce Buchberger's Criterion for Module Border Bases and give an algorithm for the computation of module border bases that uses linear algebra techniques. In the second part, we further generalize the notion of module border bases to quotient modules. We then show the connection between quotient module border bases and special module border bases and deduce characterizations similar to the ones for module border bases. Moreover, we give an algorithm for the computation of quotient module border bases using linear algebra techniques, again. At last, we prove that subideal border bases are isomorphic to special quotient module border bases. This isomorphy immediately yields characterizations and an algorithm for the computation of subideal border bases.

1. Introduction

Border bases of zero-dimensional ideals have turned out to be a good alternative for Gröbner bases as they have nice numerical properties, see for instance [Ste04], [KPR09], [Mou07] and [MT08]. In the paper [KP11], border bases have been generalized to subideal border bases. The main difference is that the authors additionally ensure that all the computation takes place in a so-called "subideal". This allows them to take external knowledge about the system into account, e. g. if some physical properties are known to be satisfied. We use a similar construction in this paper in order to generalize border bases and subideal border bases of zero-dimensional ideals, i. e. ideals with finite codimension, to the module setting. Therefore, we introduce new concepts, namely module border bases and quotient module border bases of submodules with finite codimension.

In Part 1 of this paper, we introduce the notion of module border bases of free modules with finite rank as a generalization of border bases to the module setting. More precisely, we regard a polynomial ring P in finitely many indeterminates and determine bases of P-submodules $U \subseteq P^r$ with finite codimension similar to border bases, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$. We show that we can reuse the concepts and ideas of border

---

Date: February 27, 2013.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13P10.

Key words and phrases. border bases, module border bases, quotient module border bases, subideal border bases, characterization, computation.

Special thanks go to Martin Kreuzer and Tobias Kaiser, both Universität Passau (Germany), who have corrected my master thesis—which brought me to the ideas in this paper—and with whom I have had helpful discussions that led to the final version of this paper.

bases introduced in [KR05, Section 6.4], [KK05], and [KK06] in an almost straightforward way to have corresponding results for module border bases. We firstly introduce the basic concepts and a division algorithm for module border bases (Theorem 2.14) in Section 2, then we prove the existence and uniqueness of module border bases (Proposition 3.1) in Section 3. In Section 4, we characterize module border bases via the special generation property (Theorem 4.1), via border form modules (Theorem 4.3), via rewrite rules (Theorem 4.8), via commuting matrices (Theorem 4.13), and via liftings of border syzygies (Theorem 4.20). Finally, we determine Buchberger's Criterion for Module Border Bases (Theorem 4.22), which allows us to check easily whether a given module border prebasis is a module border basis, or not. At last, we give an algorithm for the computation of module border bases which uses linear algebra techniques in Section 5.

In Part 2, we further generalize the notion of module border bases of free modules to module border bases of quotient modules. More precisely, we regard a polynomial ring P in finitely many indeterminates and determine bases of P-submodules $U^S \subseteq P^r/S$ with finite codimension similar to border bases, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S \subseteq P^r$ is a given P-submodule. In Section 6, we introduce the basic concepts of quotient module border bases. For a quotient module border prebasis, we then define characterizing module border prebases (Definition 6.7) and use these characterizing module border prebases to characterize quotient module border bases (Theorem 6.10). As an immediate consequence, we give an algorithm for the computation of quotient module border bases with linear algebra techniques (Corollary 6.14) and characterize quotient module border bases similar to module border bases via the special generation property (Corollary 6.16), via border form modules (Corollary 6.17), via rewrite rules (Corollary 6.18), via commuting matrices (Corollary 6.19), via liftings of border syzygies (Corollary 6.20), and via Buchberger's Criterion for Quotient Module Border Bases (Corollary 6.21).

At last, we show that subideal border bases—which have recently been introduced in [KP11]—can be regarded as special quotient module border bases in Section 7. Therefore, the characterizations of quotient module border bases in Section 6 immediately yield corresponding characterizations of subideal border bases (Remark 7.7). In particular, we get another proof for the characterization of subideal border bases via the special generation property, which has already been proven in [KP11], and we get the characterizations of subideal border bases via border form modules, via rewrite rules, via commuting matrices, via liftings of border syzygies, and via Buchberger's Criterion for Subideal Border Bases which have not been proven by now. Moreover, the algorithm for the computation of quotient module border bases can be used to determine an algorithm for the computation of subideal border bases with linear algebra techniques (Corollary 7.4). The only way to compute subideal border bases by now uses Gröbner bases techniques and thus needs, in general, much more computational effort (cf. [KP11, Section 6]). Furthermore, we give some remarks how the further results about subideal border bases in [KP11], e. g. a division algorithm or an index, coincide with our construction of subideal border bases as special quotient module border bases.

For the whole paper, we use the notation and results of [KR00] and [KR05]. In particular, we let K be a field and $P = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring in the indeterminates $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Furthermore, we let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{e_1, \ldots, e_r\} \subseteq P^r$ be the canonical P-module basis of the free P-module P^r. The monoid of all terms $x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n} \in P$ with $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{N}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{T}^n$ and the monoid of all terms $te_k \in P^r$ with $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$. The set of all terms in $\mathbb{T}^n$ with degree $d \in \mathbb{N}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{T}^n_d$ and we use similar constructions, e. g. $\mathbb{T}^n_{\leq d}\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$ denotes the set of all terms $te_k \in \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$

such that $\deg(t) \leq d$. Moreover, for any term ordering σ on the set of terms $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$ and P-submodule $U \subseteq P^r$, we let $\mathrm{LT}_\sigma\{U\} = \{\mathrm{LT}_\sigma(\mathcal{V}) \mid \mathcal{V} \in U \setminus \{0\}\}$ be the monomodule of all leading terms of the vectors in $U \setminus \{0\}$, and we let $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U) = \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle \setminus \mathrm{LT}_\sigma\{U\}$. At last, for every P-module M (respectively K-vector space) and every P-submodule $U \subseteq M$ (respectively K-vector subspace), we let

$$\varepsilon_U : M \twoheadrightarrow M/U, \quad m \mapsto m + U$$

be the canonical P-module epimorphism (K-vector space epimorphism).

Part 1. Module Border Bases of Free Modules

In the first part of this paper, we generalize the results about border bases of zero-dimensional ideals in P, i. e. ideals which have finite K-codimension in P, in [KR05, Section 6.4], [KK05], and [KK06] to the module setting. We imitate the definitions and propositions there in order to have similar results for P-submodules $U \subseteq P^r$ of finite K-codimension in the free P-module P^r. At first, we generalize the concepts of border bases and the corresponding division algorithm to module border bases in Section 2. Section 3 then shows the existence and uniqueness of module border bases. In Section 4, we characterize module border bases the same way as border bases have been characterized. At last we determine an algorithm that computes module border bases in Section 5.

2. Module Border Division

In this section, we generalize the concept of border basis of zero-dimensional ideals from [KR05, Section 6.4] to the module setting in a straightforward way. We see that the analogs of order ideals, namely order modules, cf. Definition 2.4, are also subsets of $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$ which are closed under forming divisors. This allows us to define the concepts of borders in Definition 2.5, of the index of a order module in Definition 2.10 and module border bases in Definition 2.13. At last, we determine a division algorithm for module border bases in Theorem 2.14. Similar to Gröbner bases and border bases, this division algorithm plays a central role in many proofs. We end up this section with some immediate consequences of this division algorithm.

We start with the definition and properties of order ideals. Our definition of order ideals generalizes the order ideals defined in [KR05, Defn. 6.4.3], namely we also regard the empty set as an order ideal. Though this seems to be quite a technical act, we see in Remark 5.5 that this generalization is necessary.

Definition 2.1. A set $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ is called an **order ideal** if it is closed under forming divisors.

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be an order ideal.

a) We call the set

$$\partial^1\mathcal{O} = \partial\mathcal{O} = ((\mathbb{T}^n_1 \cdot \mathcal{O}) \cup \{1\}) \setminus \mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$$

the **(first) border** of $\mathcal{O}$. The **(first) border closure** of $\mathcal{O}$ is the set

$$\overline{\partial^1\mathcal{O}} = \overline{\partial\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O} \cup \partial\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n.$$

b) For every $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, we inductively define the $(k+1)^{\mathbf{st}}$ **border** of $\mathcal{O}$ by the rule

$$\partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O} = \partial(\overline{\partial^k\mathcal{O}}) \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n,$$

and the $(k+1)^{\mathbf{st}}$ **border closure** by the rule

$$\overline{\partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O}} = \overline{\partial^k\mathcal{O}} \cup \partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n.$$

For convenience, we let

$$\partial^0\mathcal{O} = \overline{\partial^0\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O}.$$

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be an order ideal.*

a) *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have a disjoint union*

$$\overline{\partial^k\mathcal{O}} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} \partial^i\mathcal{O}.$$

b) *We have a disjoint union*

$$\mathbb{T}^n = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \partial^i\mathcal{O}.$$

c) *For every $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^k\mathcal{O} &= ((\mathbb{T}^n_k \cdot \mathcal{O}) \cup \mathbb{T}^n_{k-1}) \setminus (\mathbb{T}^n_{<k} \cdot \mathcal{O}) \\ &= \begin{cases} (\mathbb{T}^n_k \cdot \mathcal{O}) \setminus (\mathbb{T}^n_{<k} \cdot \mathcal{O}) & \text{if } \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset, \\ \mathbb{T}^n_{k-1} & \text{if } \mathcal{O} = \emptyset. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

d) *Let $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$ be a term. Then there exists a factorization of the form $t = t'b$ with a term $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $b \in \partial\mathcal{O}$ if and only if $t \in \mathbb{T}^n \setminus \mathcal{O}$.*

Proof. We start to prove claim a) with induction over $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For the induction start, Definition 2.2 yields

$$\overline{\partial^0\mathcal{O}} = \partial^0\mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{0} \partial^i\mathcal{O}$$

and

$$\overline{\partial^1\mathcal{O}} = \overline{\partial^0\mathcal{O}} \cup \partial^1\mathcal{O} = \partial^0\mathcal{O} \cup \partial^1\mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{1} \partial^i\mathcal{O}.$$

For every $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, Definition 2.2 and the induction hypothesis yield

$$\overline{\partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O}} = \overline{\partial^k\mathcal{O}} \cup \partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} \partial^i\mathcal{O} \cup \partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k+1} \partial^i\mathcal{O}.$$

Moreover, for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i \neq j$, the borders $\partial^i\mathcal{O}$ and $\partial^j\mathcal{O}$ are disjoint according to Definition 2.2. Thus the claim follows.

Since every term in $\mathbb{T}^n$ is in $\partial^i\mathcal{O}$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ by Definition 2.2, claim b) is a direct consequence of claim a).

We now prove claim c) by induction over $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. For the induction start $k = 1$, Definition 2.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^1\mathcal{O} &= ((\mathbb{T}^n_1 \cdot \mathcal{O}) \cup \{1\}) \setminus \mathcal{O} \\ &= ((\mathbb{T}^n_1 \cdot \mathcal{O}) \cup \mathbb{T}^n_0) \setminus (\mathbb{T}^n_{<1} \cdot \mathcal{O}).\end{aligned}$$

For the induction step, we let $k > 1$. Then the induction hypothesis and Definition 2.2 yield

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^k\mathcal{O} &= \partial(\overline{\partial^{k-1}\mathcal{O}})\\ &= \partial(\overline{((\mathbb{T}^n_{k-1}\cdot\mathcal{O})\cup\mathbb{T}^n_{k-2})\setminus(\mathbb{T}^n_{<k-1}\cdot\mathcal{O})})\\ &= \partial((\mathbb{T}^n_{\leq k-1}\cdot\mathcal{O})\cup\mathbb{T}^n_{\leq k-2})\\ &= ((\mathbb{T}^n_1\cdot\mathbb{T}^n_{\leq k-1}\cdot\mathcal{O})\cup(\mathbb{T}^n_1\cdot\mathbb{T}^n_{\leq k-2}))\setminus((\mathbb{T}^n_{\leq k-1}\cdot\mathcal{O})\cup\mathbb{T}^n_{\leq k-2})\\ &= ((\mathbb{T}^n_k\cdot\mathcal{O})\cup\mathbb{T}^n_{k-1})\setminus(\mathbb{T}^n_{<k}\cdot\mathcal{O}).\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{O}\neq\emptyset$, we have $1\in\mathcal{O}$ by Definition 2.1, and thus $\mathbb{T}^n_{k-1}\setminus(\mathbb{T}^n_{<k}\cdot\mathcal{O})=\emptyset$, and the equation above shows

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^k\mathcal{O} &= ((\mathbb{T}^n_k\cdot\mathcal{O})\setminus(\mathbb{T}^n_{<k}\cdot\mathcal{O}))\cup(\mathbb{T}^n_{k-1}\setminus(\mathbb{T}^n_{<k}\cdot\mathcal{O}))\\ &= (\mathbb{T}^n_k\cdot\mathcal{O})\setminus(\mathbb{T}^n_{<k}\cdot\mathcal{O}).\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{O}=\emptyset$, the equation above yields

$$\partial^k\mathcal{O} = (\emptyset\cup\mathbb{T}^n_{k-1})\setminus\emptyset = \mathbb{T}^n_{k-1},$$

and thus claim c) follows.

Finally, we prove claim d). We distinguish two cases.
For the first case, suppose that $\mathcal{O}=\emptyset$. Then we have $\partial\mathcal{O}=\{1\}$ by Definition 2.2 and for every term $t\in\mathbb{T}^n\setminus\mathcal{O}=\mathbb{T}^n$, there is the factorization $t=t\cdot 1$.
For the second case, suppose that $\mathcal{O}\neq\emptyset$. Let $t\in\mathbb{T}^n\setminus\mathcal{O}$. Then there exists a $k\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}$ such that $t\in\partial^k\mathcal{O}=(\mathbb{T}^n_k\cdot\mathcal{O})\setminus(\mathbb{T}^n_{<k}\cdot\mathcal{O})$ according to the claims b) and c). In particular, we can write $t=x_\ell t_1t_2$ with $\ell\in\{1,\dots,n\}$, $t_1\in\mathbb{T}^n_{k-1}$, and $t_2\in\mathcal{O}$. Assume that $x_\ell t_2\in\mathcal{O}$. Then we get the contradiction $t=t_1(x_\ell t_2)\in\mathbb{T}^n_{<k}\cdot\mathcal{O}$. Thus Definition 2.2 yields $x_\ell t_2\in\partial\mathcal{O}$, and the the first implication follows because of $t=t_1(x_\ell t_2)$. For the converse implication, let $t'\in\mathbb{T}^n$ and $b\in\partial\mathcal{O}$. Assume that $t'b\in\mathcal{O}$. Then Definition 2.1 yields the contradiction $b\in\mathcal{O}$. Thus we have $t'b\in\mathbb{T}^n\setminus\mathcal{O}$ and the claim follows. □

Having defined order ideals of $\mathbb{T}^n$, we generalize this notion to order module setting. We start with the definition of order modules of $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle$, the border of order modules, and some propositions of them. Our definitions and propositions are analogous versions of the corresponding ones in [KR05, Defn. 6.4.3/4] and [KR05, Prop. 6.4.6].

Definition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{O}_1,\dots,\mathcal{O}_r\subseteq\mathbb{T}^n$ be order ideals. Then we call the set

$$\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{O}_1\cdot e_1\cup\cdots\cup\mathcal{O}_r\cdot e_r\subseteq\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_r,\dots,e_r\rangle$$

an **order module**.

Definition 2.5. Let $\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{O}_1e_1\cup\cdots\cup\mathcal{O}_re_r$ with order ideals $\mathcal{O}_1,\dots,\mathcal{O}_r\subseteq\mathbb{T}^n$ be an order module.

a) We call the set

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^1\mathcal{M}=\partial\mathcal{M} &= ((\mathbb{T}^n_1\cdot\mathcal{M})\cup\{e_1,\dots,e_r\})\setminus\mathcal{M}\\ &= \partial\mathcal{O}_1\cdot e_1\cup\cdots\cup\partial\mathcal{O}_r\cdot e_r\subseteq\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle\end{aligned}$$

the **(first) border** of $\mathcal{M}$. The **(first) border closure** of $\mathcal{M}$ is the set

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\partial^1\mathcal{M}}=\overline{\partial\mathcal{M}} &= \mathcal{M}\cup\partial\mathcal{M}\\ &= \overline{\partial\mathcal{O}_1}\cdot e_1\cup\cdots\cup\overline{\partial\mathcal{O}_r}\cdot e_r\subseteq\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

b) For every $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, we inductively define the $(k+1)^{\textbf{st}}$ **border** of $\mathcal{M}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^{k+1}\mathcal{M} &= \partial(\overline{\partial^k\mathcal{M}}) \\ &= \partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O}_1 \cdot e_1 \cup \cdots \cup \partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O}_r \cdot e_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

and the $(k+1)^{\textbf{st}}$ **border closure** of $\mathcal{M}$ by the rule

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\partial^{k+1}\mathcal{M}} &= \overline{\partial^k\mathcal{M}} \cup \partial^{k+1}\mathcal{M} \\ &= \overline{\partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O}_1} \cdot e_1 \cup \cdots \cup \overline{\partial^{k+1}\mathcal{O}_r} \cdot e_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

For convenience, we let

$$\partial^0\mathcal{M} = \overline{\partial^0\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}.$$

Example 2.6. Let K be a field, and let

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = \{x, y, 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_2 = \{x^2, x, 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2.$$

Then $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ are both order ideals with first borders

$$\partial\mathcal{O}_1 = \{x^2, xy, y^2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2$$

and

$$\partial\mathcal{O}_2 = \{x^3, x^2y, xy, y\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2,$$

and second borders

$$\partial^2\mathcal{O}_1 = \{x^3, x^2y, xy^2, y^3\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2$$

and

$$\partial^2\mathcal{O}_2 = \{x^4, x^3y, x^2y^2, xy^2, y^2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2.$$

Let $e_1 = (1,0) \in (K[x,y])^2$ and $e_2 = (0,1) \in (K[x,y])^2$. Then

$$\mathcal{M} = \{xe_1, ye_1, e_1, x^2e_2, xe_2, e_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2\langle e_1, e_2\rangle$$

is an order module with first border

$$\partial\mathcal{M} = \{x^2e_1, xye_1, y^2e_1, x^3e_2, x^2ye_2, xye_2, ye_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2\langle e_1, e_2\rangle$$

and second border

$$\partial^2\mathcal{M} = \{x^3e_1, x^2ye_1, xy^2e_1, y^3e_1, x^4e_2, x^3ye_2, x^2y^2e_2, xy^2e_2, y^2e_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2\langle e_1, e_2\rangle.$$

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_1e_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_re_r$ with order ideals $\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be an order module.*

a) *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have a disjoint union*

$$\overline{\partial^k\mathcal{M}} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} \partial^i\mathcal{M}.$$

b) *We have a disjoint union*

$$\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \partial^i\mathcal{M}.$$

c) *For every $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, we have*

$$\partial^k\mathcal{M} = ((\mathbb{T}^n_k \cdot \mathcal{M}) \cup \mathbb{T}^n_{k-1}\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle) \setminus (\mathbb{T}^n_{<k} \cdot \mathcal{M}).$$

d) *Let* $te_k \in \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle$ *be a term. Then there exists a factorization of the form* $te_k = t'be_k$ *with a term* $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n$ *and* $be_k \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ *if and only if* $te_k \in \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle \setminus \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. For every $s \in \{1,\dots,r\}$, we have $\{(p_1,\dots,p_r) \in \mathcal{M} \mid p_s \neq 0\} = \mathcal{O}_s \cdot e_s$ by Definition 2.4. Thus the claim immediately follows from Proposition 2.3. □

Since Proposition 2.3 is a natural generalization of [KR05, Prop. 6.4.6], which additionally allows empty order ideals, we can define an $\mathcal{O}$-index for an order ideal $\mathcal{O}$ just the way it has been defined in [KR05, Defn. 6.4.7].

Definition 2.8. Let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be an order ideal.

a) For every term $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$, the number $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t \in \partial^i\mathcal{O}$, which is unique according to Proposition 2.3, is called the **$\mathcal{O}$-index** of t and it is denoted by $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(t)$.

b) For a polynomial $p \in P \setminus \{0\}$, we define the **$\mathcal{O}$-index** of p by

$$\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(p) = \max\{\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(t) \mid t \in \mathrm{Supp}(p)\}.$$

Now we can immediately deduce the same properties for the $\mathcal{O}$-index of an order ideal $\mathcal{O}$, as it has been done in [KR05, Prop. 6.4.8]. Though the proof stays essentially the same when we also regard the empty set as an order ideal, we will give the proof of the following proposition for the convenience of the reader.

Proposition 2.9. *Let* $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ *be an order ideal.*

a) *For a term* $t \in \mathbb{T}^n \setminus \mathcal{O}$, *the number* $i = \mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(t)$ *is the smallest natural number such that* $t = t'b$ *with* $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n_{i-1}$ *and* $b \in \partial\mathcal{O}$.

b) *Given a term* $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$ *and a term* $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n$, *we have*

$$\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(tt') \leq \deg(t) + \mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(t').$$

c) *For two polynomials* $p, q \in P \setminus \{0\}$ *such that* $p+q \neq 0$, *we have the inequality*

$$\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(p+q) \leq \max\{\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(p), \mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(q)\}.$$

d) *For two polynomials* $p, q \in P \setminus \{0\}$, *we have the inequality*

$$\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(pq) \leq \deg(p) + \mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{O}}(q).$$

Proof. Claim a) is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.3, and claim b) follows immediately from claim a). Since $\mathrm{Supp}(p+q) \subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(p) \cup \mathrm{Supp}(q)$, claim c) follows immediately with Definition 2.8. At last, claim d) follows from claim b) since $\mathrm{Supp}(pq) \subseteq \{tt' \mid t \in \mathrm{Supp}(p), t'' \in \mathrm{Supp}(q)\}$. □

Since Proposition 2.7 is an analogous version of [KR05, Prop. 6.4.6] for an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle$, we can now define the $\mathcal{M}$-index similar to the index of order ideals in Definition 2.8, and deduce some properties of it as it has been done in Proposition 2.9.

Definition 2.10. Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_1e_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_re_r$ with order ideals $\mathcal{O}_1,\dots,\mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be an order module.

a) For every term $te_k \in \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle$, the number $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $te_k \in \partial^i\mathcal{M}$, which is unique according to Proposition 2.7, is called the **$\mathcal{M}$-index** of te_k and is denoted by $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(te_k)$.

b) For a vector $\mathcal{V} = (p_1,\dots,p_r) \in P^r \setminus \{0\}$, we define the **$\mathcal{M}$-index** of $\mathcal{V}$ by

$$\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) = \max\{\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(te_k) \mid te_k \in \mathrm{Supp}(\mathcal{V})\}.$$

Example 2.11. We consider the order module

$$\mathcal{M} = \{xe_1, ye_1, e_1, x^2e_2, xe_2, e_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2\langle e_1, e_2\rangle$$

of Example 2.6, again. Then we have

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(xe_1) = 0$$

and

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(x^2y^2e_2) = 2.$$

Furthermore, we see that

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(xe_1 + x^2y^2e_2) = \max\{0, 2\} = 2.$$

Proposition 2.12. *Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_1e_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_re_r$ with order ideals $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be an order module.*

a) *For a term $te_k \in \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle \setminus \mathcal{M}$, the number $i = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(te_k)$ is the smallest natural number such that $t = t'b$ with $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n_{i-1}$ and $b \in \partial\mathcal{O}_k$.*

b) *Given a term $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and a term $t'e_k \in \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle$, we have*

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(tt'e_k) \leq \deg(t) + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(t'e_k).$$

c) *For two vectors $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} \in P^r \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{W} \neq 0$, we have the inequality*

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{W}) \leq \max\{\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}), \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{W})\}.$$

d) *For a vector $\mathcal{V} \in P^r \setminus \{0\}$ and a polynomial $p \in P \setminus \{0\}$, we have the inequality*

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(p\mathcal{V}) \leq \deg(p) + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}).$$

Proof. Let $s \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Then we have $\{(p_1, \dots, p_r) \in \mathcal{M} \mid p_s \neq 0\} = \mathcal{O}_s \cdot e_s$ by Definition 2.4. Thus the claim follows immediately from Definition 2.10 and Proposition 2.9. $\square$

Now we have all the ingredients to define module border bases in an analogous way as border bases have been introduced in [KR05, Defn. 6.4.10/13]. Recall that, for every P-module M (respectively K-vector space) and for every P-submodule $U \subseteq M$ (respectively K-vector subspace),

$$\varepsilon_U : M \twoheadrightarrow M/U, \quad m \mapsto m + U$$

denotes the canonical P-module epimorphism (respectively K-vector space epimorphism).

Definition 2.13. Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_1e_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_re_r$ be an order module where we let $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be finite order ideals. We write $\mathcal{M} = \{t_1e_{\alpha_1}, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M} = \{b_1e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}\}$ with $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and with $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$.

a) A set of vectors $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\nu\} \subseteq P^r$ is called an **$\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis** if the vectors have the form

$$\mathcal{G}_j = b_je_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij}t_ie_{\alpha_i}$$

with $c_{ij} \in K$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$.

b) Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\nu\} \subseteq P^r$ be an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis and let $U \subseteq P^r$ be a P-submodule. We call $\mathcal{G}$ an **$\mathcal{M}$-module border basis** of U if $\mathcal{G} \subseteq U$, if the set

$$\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{M}) = \{t_1e_{\alpha_1} + U, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + U\}$$

is a K-vector space basis of P^r/U and if $\#\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{M}) = \mu$.

For the remainder of this section, we let $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be finite order ideals and

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_1 e_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{O}_r e_r = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\}$$

be an order module with border

$$\partial\mathcal{M} = \partial\mathcal{O}_1 e_1 \cup \dots \cup \partial\mathcal{O}_r e_r = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}\},$$

where $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Moreover, we let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\nu\} \subseteq P^r$ with

$$\mathcal{G}_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i},$$

where $c_{ij} \in K$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$, be an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis.

Next we generalize the Border Division Algorithm [KR05, Prop. 6.4.11] to the Module Border Division Algorithm and deduce some consequences of it similar to the ones in [KR05, Section 6.4.A].

Algorithm 1 `divAlg`$(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{G})$

```
Require: $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$
    $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\nu\} \subseteq P^r$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis where we denote
    $\mathcal{M} = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\}$ and $\partial\mathcal{M} = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}\}$ with $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$
    and $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$.
 1: $(p_1, \dots, p_\nu) := 0 \in P^\nu$
 2: $(q_1, \dots, q_r) := \mathcal{V}$
 3: while $(q_1, \dots, q_r) \neq 0$ and $\mathrm{ind}_\mathcal{M}((q_1, \dots, q_r)) > 0$ do
 4:     choose $te_k \in \mathrm{Supp}((q_1, \dots, q_r))$ with $\mathrm{ind}_\mathcal{M}(te_k) = \mathrm{ind}_\mathcal{M}((q_1, \dots, q_r))$.
 5:     Determine the smallest index $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ such that there exists a term
        $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n$ with $\deg(t') = \mathrm{ind}_\mathcal{M}((q_1, \dots, q_r)) - 1$ and $te_k = t' b_j e_{\beta_j}$.
 6:     Let $a \in K$ be the coefficient of $te_k = t' b_j e_{\beta_j}$ in $(q_1, \dots, q_r)$.
 7:     $p_j := p_j + at'$
 8:     $(q_1, \dots, q_r) := (q_1, \dots, q_r) - at'\mathcal{G}_j$
 9: end while
10: if $(q_1, \dots, q_r) = 0$ then
11:     return $((p_1, \dots, p_\nu), 0) \in P^\nu \times K^\mu$
12: end if
13: Determine $c_1, \dots, c_\mu \in K$ such that $(q_1, \dots, q_r) = c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \dots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}$.
14: return $((p_1, \dots, p_\nu), (c_1, \dots, c_\mu))$
```

Theorem 2.14. (The Module Border Division Algorithm)
Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$. Then Algorithm 1 is actually an algorithm, and the result

$$((p_1, \dots, p_\nu), (c_1, \dots, c_\mu)) := \texttt{divAlg}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{G})$$

of Algorithm 1 applied to the input data $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ satisfies the following conditions.

i) *The result $((p_1, \dots, p_\nu), (c_1, \dots, c_\mu))$ is a tuple in $P^\nu \times K^\mu$ and it does not depend on the choice of the term te_k in line 4.*

ii) *We have*

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \dots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu + c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \dots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}.$$

iii) *We have*

$$\deg(p_j) \leq \mathrm{ind}_\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ with $p_j \neq 0$.

Proof. Firstly, we show that every step of the procedure can be computed. Let m always denote the current value of $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}((q_1,\dots,q_r))$ during the procedure. The existence of a term $te_k \in \operatorname{Supp}((q_1,\dots,q_r))$ such that $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(te_k) = m$ in line 4 follows from Definition 2.10. We now take a closer look at line 5. Since the while-loop in line 3 is executed, we have $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(te_k) > 0$, i.e. $te_k \in \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle \setminus \mathcal{M}$ by Definition 2.10. By Proposition 2.12 there is a factorization $te_k = t'b_je_{\beta_j}$ with a term $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n$ where $\deg(t') = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(te_k) - 1 = m-1$ and an index $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$. At last, since the while-loop is already finished in line 13, we have $m = 0$ and thus $\operatorname{Supp}((q_1,\dots,q_r)) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ according to Definition 2.10. Altogether, we see that every step of the procedure can actually be computed.

Secondly, we prove termination. We show that the while-loop starting in line 3 is executed only finitely many times. Taking a closer look at the subtraction in line 8, we see that we subtract the vector

$$at'\mathcal{G}_j = at'b_je_{\beta_j} - at'\sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij}t_ie_{\alpha_i}$$

from $(q_1,\dots,q_r)$. By the choice of $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$ and $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n_{m-1}$ in line 5, and the choice of $a \in K$ in line 6, it follows that the term $te_k = t'b_je_{\beta_j}$ with $\mathcal{M}$-index m is replaced by terms of the form $t't_ie_{\alpha_i} \in \overline{\partial^{m-1}\mathcal{M}}$ with $i \in \{1,\dots,\mu\}$, which have strictly smaller $\mathcal{M}$-index according to Proposition 2.12. The procedure hence terminates after finitely many steps because there are only finitely many terms of $\mathcal{M}$-index smaller than or equal to a given term. Altogether, we see that the procedure is actually an algorithm.

We go on with the proof of the correctness. To this end, we show that the equation

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu + (q_1,\dots,q_r)$$

is an invariant of the while-loop in line 3. Before the first iteration of the while-loop, we have $p_1 = \cdots = p_\nu = 0$ and $(q_1,\dots,q_r) = \mathcal{V}$, i.e. the invariant is obviously fulfilled. We now regard the changes of $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu) \in P^\nu$ and $(q_1,\dots,q_r) \in P^r$ during one iteration of the while-loop. Let $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu) \in P^\nu$ and $(q_1,\dots,q_r) \in P^r$ be such that the invariant holds, and let $(p'_1,\dots,p'_\nu) \in P^\nu$ and $(q'_1,\dots,q'_r) \in P^r$ be the values of $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu)$ and $(q_1,\dots,q_r)$ after one iteration of the while-loop. The values of the vectors $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu) \in P^\nu$ and $(q_1,\dots,q_r) \in P^r$ are only changed in line 7 and line 8. Thus we have $p'_j = p_j + at'$, $p'_i = p_i$ for all $i \in \{1,\dots,\nu\} \setminus \{j\}$, and $(q'_1,\dots,q'_r) = (q_1,\dots,q_r) - at'\mathcal{G}_j$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V} &= p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu + (q_1,\dots,q_r)\\ &= p'_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p'_{j-1}\mathcal{G}_{j-1} + (p'_j - at')\mathcal{G}_j + p'_{j+1}\mathcal{G}_{j+1} + \cdots + p'_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu\\ &\quad + ((q'_1,\dots,q'_r) + at'\mathcal{G}_j)\\ &= p'_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots p'_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu + (q'_1,\dots,q'_r),\end{aligned}$$

i.e. the invariant is also satisfied after one iteration of the while-loop. By induction over the number of iterations of the while-loop, we see that the invariant is always satisfied.

As we have already seen in the proof of the termination, the term t' in line 5—and thus also the polynomials $p_1,\dots,p_\nu$ at the end of the algorithm—always has at most the degree $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$. If the algorithm terminates in line 11, we have

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu + (q_1,\dots,q_r) = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu.$$

If the algorithm terminates in line 13, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V} &= p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu + (q_1,\dots,q_r)\\ &= p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu + c_1t_1e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\end{aligned}$$

with $c_1,\dots,c_\mu \in K$. In both cases, the algorithm computes a representation of $\mathcal{V}$ with the claimed properties.

Finally, we prove that the result does not depend on the choice of the term te_k in line 4. This fact follows from the observation that te_k is replaced by terms of strictly smaller $\mathcal{M}$-index during every iteration of the while-loop in line 3. Thus different choices of the term te_k in line 4 do not interfere with one another. Altogether, we see that the final result, after all those terms have been rewritten, is independent of the ordering in which they are handled. □

Using the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14, we can define the normal remainder of a vector in P^r with respect to a module border prebasis in the usual way like it has been done for border prebases in [KR05, p. 427].

Definition 2.15. Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$. We apply the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ to obtain a representation

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu + c_1t_1e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}$$

with $p_1,\dots,p_\nu \in P$, $c_1,\dots,c_\mu \in K$, and

$$\deg(p_j) \le \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$

for all $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$ where $p_j \neq 0$. Then the vector

$$\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) = c_1t_1e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} \in \langle \mathcal{M}\rangle_K \subseteq P^r$$

is called the **normal remainder** of $\mathcal{V}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$.

Example 2.16. We consider Example 2.6, again, and write the order module

$$\mathcal{M} = \{xe_1, ye_1, e_1, x^2e_2, xe_2, e_2\} = \{t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_6e_{\alpha_6}\}$$

and its border

$$\partial\mathcal{M} = \{x^2e_1, xye_1, y^2e_1, x^3e_2, x^2ye_2, xye_2, ye_2\} = \{b_1e_{\beta_1},\dots,b_7e_{\beta_7}\}.$$

Then the set $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_7\} \subseteq P^2$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1 &= x^2e_1 - ye_1 + e_2,\\ \mathcal{G}_2 &= xye_1 - e_2,\\ \mathcal{G}_3 &= y^2e_1 - xe_2,\\ \mathcal{G}_4 &= x^3e_2 - e_1,\\ \mathcal{G}_5 &= x^2ye_2 - e_1 - e_2,\\ \mathcal{G}_6 &= xye_2 + 3e_1,\\ \mathcal{G}_7 &= ye_2 - xe_1 - ye_1 - e_1 - e_2\end{aligned}$$

is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis by Definition 2.13. We consider the steps of the Module Border Division Algorithm 1 applied to

$$\mathcal{V} = x^3e_1 + xye_1 + x^3ye_2 \in P^2$$

and $\mathcal{G}$ in detail.

The initialization process of the algorithm in the lines 1–2 yields

$$(p_1,\dots,p_7) = (0,0,0,0,0,0,0)$$

and

$$(q_1, q_2) = (x^3 + xy, x^3y).$$

Since

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}((q_1, q_2)) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(x^3e_1) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(x^3ye_2) = 2 > 0,$$

the while-loop in line 3 is executed. We choose x^3ye_2 in line 4. Then we have $j = 4$ and the factorization

$$x^3ye_2 = y \cdot x^3e_2 = y \cdot b_4e_{\beta_4}$$

in line 5. After line 7, we have

$$(p_1, \ldots, p_7) = (0, 0, 0, y, 0, 0, 0),$$

and after line 8, we have

$$(q_1, q_2) = (x^3 + xy, x^3y) - y \cdot (-1, x^3) = (x^3 + xy + y, 0).$$

Now the $\mathcal{M}$-index is

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}((q_1, q_2)) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(x^3e_1) = 2 > 0,$$

and we must choose x^3e_1 in line 4. Then we have $j = 1$ and the factorization

$$x^3e_1 = x \cdot x^2e_1 = x \cdot b_1e_{\beta_1}$$

in line 5. This yields

$$(p_1, \ldots, p_7) = (x, 0, 0, y, 0, 0, 0)$$

after line 7, and

$$(q_1, q_2) = (x^3 + xy + y, 0) - x \cdot (x^2 - y, 1) = (2xy + y, -x)$$

after line 8. Now the $\mathcal{M}$-index has decreased to

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}((q_1, q_2)) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(xye_1) = 1 > 0,$$

and we must choose xye_1 in line 4. Then we have $j = 2$ and the factorization

$$xye_1 = 1 \cdot xye_1 = 1 \cdot b_2e_{\beta_2}$$

in line 5. This yields

$$(p_1, \ldots, p_7) = (x, 2, 0, y, 0, 0, 0)$$

after line 7, and

$$(q_1, q_2) = (2xy + y, -x) - 2 \cdot (xy, -1) = (y, -x + 2).$$

after line 8. After these iterations, we see that

$$(q_1, q_2) \neq 0$$

and

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}((q_1, q_2)) = 0.$$

Since

$$(q_1, q_2) = (y, -x + 2) = t_2e_{\alpha_2} - t_5e_{\alpha_5} + 2t_6e_{\alpha_6},$$

the algorithm returns

$$((x, 2, 0, y, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, -1, 2)) \in P^7 \times K^6$$

in line 13.

Moreover, this yields

$$\mathcal{V} = x^3e_1 + xye_1 + x^3ye_2 = x\mathcal{G}_1 + 2\mathcal{G}_2 + y\mathcal{G}_4 + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V})$$

where

$$\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) = ye_1 - xe_2 + 2e_2 \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K.$$

according to Theorem 2.14 and Definition 2.15.

Now we use the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to deduce some propositions about module border bases. We start to prove that an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis $\mathcal{G}$ of a P-submodule $U \subseteq P^r$ is indeed a basis, i. e. that $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle = U$ holds. The proof of this result follows exactly like the corresponding result for border bases in [KR05, Prop. 6.4.15].

Corollary 2.17. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of a P-submodule $U \subseteq P^r$. Then $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle = U$.*

Proof. According to Definition 2.13, we have $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \subseteq U$. For the converse implication, we let $\mathcal{V} \in U$. We apply the Module Border Basis Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ to obtain a representation

$$\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W} + c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}$$

with $\mathcal{W} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \subseteq U$, and $c_1, \ldots, c_\mu \in K$. It follows that

$$U = \mathcal{V} + U = c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + U \in P^r/U.$$

Since $\mathcal{G}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U, Definition 2.13 yields

$$c_1 = \cdots = c_\mu = 0$$

and thus $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. □

The proof of the next corollary follows the proof of [KP11, Coro. 3.8].

Corollary 2.18. *We have $\langle \varepsilon_{\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle}(\mathcal{M}) \rangle_K = P^r/\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. In particular, for every vector $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, the normal remainder $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V})$ of $\mathcal{V}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ is a representative of the residue class $\mathcal{V} + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$. We apply the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ to obtain a representation

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V})$$

with $p_1, \ldots, p_\nu \in P$ and $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. Thus we have

$$\mathcal{V} + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle = \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \in \langle \varepsilon_{\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle}(\mathcal{M}) \rangle_K.$$

The other inclusion follows trivially because $\mathcal{M} \subseteq P^r$. □

We are now able to give a first characterization of module border bases similar to the characterization of border bases in [KR05, Defn. 6.4.13].

Corollary 2.19. *Let $U \subseteq P^r$ be a P-submodule with $\mathcal{G} \subseteq U$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- i) *The $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U.*
- ii) *We have $U \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K = \{0\}$.*
- iii) *We have $P^r = U \oplus \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$.*

Proof. We start to prove that i) implies ii). Let $\mathcal{V} \in U \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. Then there exist $c_1, \ldots, c_\mu \in K$ such that

$$\mathcal{V} = c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}.$$

Modulo U, this yields

$$U = \mathcal{V} + U = c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + U \in P^r/U.$$

As $\mathcal{G}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U, it follows $c_1 = \cdots = c_\mu = 0$ and thus $\mathcal{V} = 0$ by Definition 2.13.

Next we prove that ii) implies iii). As we have $U \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K = \{0\}$, it suffices to prove that $P^r = U + \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. Obviously we have $P^r \supseteq U + \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. In order to prove the converse inclusion, we let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$. Applying the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, we obtain a representation

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$$

with $p_1, \ldots, p_\nu \in P$ and $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. The hypothesis $\mathcal{G} \subseteq U$ hence yields the claim.

Finally, we prove that iii) implies i). Let $c_1, \ldots, c_\mu \in K$ be coefficients such that

$$U = c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + U \in P^r/U.$$

Then we have

$$c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} \in U \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$$

which yields

$$c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} = 0$$

because of $P^r = U \oplus \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. As $\mathcal{M}$ is K-linearly independent, it follows that $c_1 = \cdots = c_\mu = 0$, and we see that $\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq P^r/U$ is K-linearly independent and that $\#\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{M}) = \mu$. Moreover, every vector $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$ can be written in the form $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W} + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V})$ where $\mathcal{W} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ according to Corollary 2.18. As $\mathcal{G} \subseteq U$, the claim now follows by Definition 2.13. □

If $\mathcal{G}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border bases of a P-submodule $U \subseteq P^r$, we can introduce a normal form with respect to a P-submodule $U \subseteq P^r$ for every vector in P^r similarly to the way it has been done in [KR05, Defn. 6.4.20] and [KR05, Prop. 6.4.19/21] for border bases.

Lemma 2.20. *Let $U \subseteq P^r$ be a P-submodule, and let $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$ be two $\mathcal{M}$-module border bases of U. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}'}(\mathcal{V})$$

for every vector $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$. We apply the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, and to $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$ in order to obtain two representations

$$\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W} + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{W}' + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}'}(\mathcal{V})$$

with $\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}' \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ and $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}), \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}'}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. As $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$ are $\mathcal{M}$-module border bases of U, the claim follows since we have

$$\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) - \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}'}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{W}' - \mathcal{W} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \subseteq U \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K = \{0\}$$

according to Definition 2.13 and Corollary 2.19. □

Remark 2.21. Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$ be a vector. Similar to the situation of Gröbner bases and border bases, the normal remainder of $\mathcal{V}$ with respect to the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ is a representative of the residue class $\mathcal{V} + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \in P^r/\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ by Corollary 2.18. But the normal remainder of $\mathcal{V}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ depends on the particularly chosen $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ and on the ordering of the elements in $\mathcal{G}$ by Definition 2.15. But if $\mathcal{G}$ is even an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$, Lemma 2.20 shows that the result is independent of the particularly chosen $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis $\mathcal{G}$, and of the ordering of the elements in $\mathcal{G}$. Thus the normal remainder defines a normal form with respect to $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ in this situation. In particular, we can also compute this normal form with the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14.

Definition 2.22. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of a P-submodule $U \subseteq P^r$, and let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$. Then we call the vector

$$\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \subseteq P^r,$$

which is unique according to Remark 2.21, the **normal form** of $\mathcal{V}$ with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ and U.

Proposition 2.23. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of a P-submodule $U \subseteq P^r$.*

a) *For all $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, we have*

$$\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathrm{NF}_{\sigma,U}(\mathcal{V})$$

if there exists a term ordering σ on $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$.

b) *We have*

$$\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(c\mathcal{V} + c'\mathcal{V}') = c\,\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(\mathcal{V}) + c'\,\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(\mathcal{V}')$$

for all $c, c' \in K$ and all $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}' \in P^r$.

c) *We have*

$$\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(\mathcal{V})) = \mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(\mathcal{V})$$

for all $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$.

d) *We have*

$$\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(p\mathcal{V}) = \mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(p\,\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(\mathcal{V}))$$

for all $p \in P$ and all $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$.

Proof. Claim a) follows because for all $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, both $\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{M},U}(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathrm{NF}_{\sigma,U}(\mathcal{V})$ are equal to the unique vector in $\mathcal{V} + U \in P^r/U$ whose support is contained in $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$ according to Definition 2.22 and [KR00, Defn. 2.4.8]. The other claims follow from the same uniqueness. □

3. Existence and Uniqueness of Module Border Bases

In this section, we show the existence and uniqueness of a module border bases of a given submodule $U \subseteq P^r$ like it has been done for border bases in [KR05, Prop. 6.4.17]. Moreover, we proof that there is a correspondence of the reduced σ-Gröbner bases of a P-submodule $U \subseteq P^r$ and the $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$-module border bases of U similar to [KR05, Prop. 6.4.18]. Finally, we give a first "naive" algorithm for the computation of module border bases that uses Gröbner bases techniques.

Like in the previous section, we let $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be finite order ideals, and we let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_1 e_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{O}_r e_r = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\}$ be an order module with border $\partial\mathcal{M} = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}\}$, where $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Furthermore, we let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\nu\} \subseteq P^r$ be an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis, where we write $\mathcal{G}_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i}$ with $c_{1j}, \dots, c_{\mu j} \in K$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$.

We start with the proof of the existence and uniqueness of module border bases. To this end, we imitate the proof of [KR05, Prop. 6.4.17].

Proposition 3.1. (Existence and Uniqueness of Module Border Bases) *Let $U \subseteq P^r$ be a P-submodule. Moreover, we let $\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq P^r/U$ be a K-vector space basis of P^r/U with $\#\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{M}) = \mu$.*

a) *There exists a unique $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U.*

b) *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis with $\mathcal{G} \subseteq U$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U.*

c) *Let K' be the field of definition of U. Then the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U is contained in $K'[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$.*

Proof. We start with the proof of claim a). Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. By Proposition 2.7 we see that $b_j e_{\beta_j} \notin \mathcal{M}$. Thus there exist $c_{1j}, \ldots, c_{\mu j} \in K$ such that

$$b_j e_{\beta_j} + U = c_{1j} t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_{\mu j} t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + U$$

and this yields

$$\mathcal{G}_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in U.$$

Now the set $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_\nu\} \subseteq U$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis, and the assumptions yield that $\mathcal{G}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U by Definition 2.13. It remains to prove the uniqueness. Let $\mathcal{G}' = \{\mathcal{G}'_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}'_\nu\} \subseteq U$ be another $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U where

$$\mathcal{G}'_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c'_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i}$$

with $c'_{ij} \in K$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. Assume there exists an $i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$ and a $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ such that $c_{ij} \neq c'_{ij}$. Then Corollary 2.19 yields the contradiction

$$0 \neq \mathcal{G}_j - \mathcal{G}'_j \in U \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K = \{0\}$$

and claim a) follows.

We go on with the proof of b). As $\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of P^r/U such that $\#\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{M}) = \mu$, we see that $\mathcal{G}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U by Definition 2.13. The claim now follows with a).

Finally, we prove claim c). Let $P' = K'[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and $U' = U \cap (P')^r$. Given a term ordering σ on $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$, the P-submodules $U \subseteq P^r$ and $U' \subseteq (P')^r$ have the same reduced σ-Gröbner basis and

$$\mathrm{LT}_\sigma\{U\} = \mathrm{LT}_\sigma\{U'\}$$

by [KR00, Lemma 2.4.16]. Hence we see that

$$\dim_K((P')^r/U') = \dim_K(P^r/U) = \#\mathcal{M}$$

according to Macaulay's Basis Theorem [KR00, Thm. 1.5.7] and Definition 2.13. Moreover, the elements of $\mathcal{M}$ are contained in $(P')^r$ and they are K-linearly independent modulo $U' \subseteq U$. Thus it follows that $\varepsilon_{U'}(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $(P')^r/U'$ and $\#\varepsilon_{U'}(\mathcal{M}) = \mu$. According to a), there exists a unique $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq P^r$ of U'. Since $\mathcal{G}'$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis with $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq U$, the claim follows from b). □

Next we show that there is a connection between certain module border bases and reduced Gröbner bases like it has been done in [KR05, Prop. 6.4.18] for the border bases case.

The set $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle \setminus \mathcal{M}$ is obviously a monomial submodule of P^r, i.e. it has a system of generators consisting of terms by [KR00, Defn. 1.3.7]. Thus there exists a uniquely determined minimal set of generators of this monomial submodule according to [KR00, Prop. 1.3.11]. The elements between this minimal generating set play an essential role in the connection of certain module border bases and reduced Gröbner bases, and thus get a name.

Definition 3.2. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an order module. We call the elements of the minimal generating set of the monomial submodule $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle \setminus \mathcal{M}$ the **corners** of $\mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $U \subseteq P^r$ be a P-submodule and let σ be a term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle$. Then there exists a unique $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$-module border basis $\mathcal{G}$ of U, and the reduced σ-Gröbner basis of U is the subset of $\mathcal{G}$ corresponding to the corners of $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$.*

Proof. By Macaulay's Basis Theorem [KR00, Thm. 1.5.7], the set $\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U))$ is a K-vector space basis of P^r/U and we have $\#\varepsilon_U(\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)) = \#\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$. Thus Proposition 3.1 implies the existence of a unique $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$-module border basis $\mathcal{G}$ of U.

In order to prove the second claim, we let $be_k \in \mathrm{LT}_\sigma\{U\}$ with $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ be a corner of $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$. The element of the reduced σ-Gröbner basis of U with leading term be_k has the form $be_k - \mathrm{NF}_{\sigma,U}(be_k)$ where $\mathrm{NF}_{\sigma,U}(be_k) \subseteq \langle \mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)\rangle_K$ by [KR00, Defn. 2.4.8]. Since the $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$-module border basis $\mathcal{G}$ of U is unique, this element of the reduced σ-Gröbner basis coincides with the element in $\mathcal{G}$ corresponding to be_k. According to the definition of the reduced σ-Gröbner basis of U, cf. [KR00, Defn. 2.4.12], the corners of $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$ are exactly the leading terms of the elements of the reduced σ-Gröbner basis of U and hence the claim follows. $\square$

Remark 3.4. The proof of Proposition 3.3 gives rise to an algorithm for the computation of a module border basis of a given P-submodule $U \subseteq P^r$ with $\mathrm{codim}_K(U, P^r) < \infty$. Let σ be any term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle$. We first have to compute a σ-Gröbner basis $\mathcal{H}$ of P^r/U to determine the order module $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$ with Macaulay's Basis Theorem [KR00, Thm. 1.5.7]. Then we have to compute its border

$$\partial\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U) = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}\}.$$

Using $\mathcal{H}$ and the Division Algorithm for Gröbner Bases [KR00, Thm. 1.6.4], we then compute

$$\mathcal{G}_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \mathrm{NF}_{\sigma,U}(b_j e_{\beta_j}) = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \mathrm{NR}_{\sigma,\mathcal{H}}(b_j e_{\beta_j}) \in U \subseteq P^r$$

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ and see that $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\nu\} \subseteq P^r$ is the $\mathcal{O}_\sigma(U)$-module border basis of U according to Proposition 3.1.

In section 5, we give a more efficient algorithm for the computation of module border bases which uses linear algebra, and which is an analogous version of the Border Basis Algorithm in [KR05, Thm. 6.4.36].

4. Characterizations of Module Border Bases

In this section, we want to characterize module border bases in an analogous way as border bases have been characterized in [KR05, Section 6.4.B] and in [KK05]. In particular, we characterize module border bases via the special generation property in Theorem 4.1, via border form modules in Theorem 4.3, via rewrite rules in Theorem 4.8, via commuting matrices in Theorem 4.13, and via liftings of border syzygies in Theorem 4.20. At last, we proof Buchberger's Criterion for Module Border Bases 4.22. This is the main result of this section as it allows us to check easily, whether a given module border prebasis is a module border bases, or not.

Like in the previous section, we let $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be finite order ideals and we let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_1 e_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{O}_r e_r = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\}$ be an order module with border $\partial\mathcal{M} = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}\}$ where $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Furthermore, we let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\nu\} \subseteq P^r$

be an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis, where we write $\mathcal{G}_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i}$ with $c_{1j}, \dots, c_{\mu j} \in K$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$.

We start to show the connection of module border bases and the special generation property which has originally been proven for border bases in [KK05, Prop. 9]. Our proof follows the corresponding version for border bases in [KR05, Prop. 6.4.23].

Theorem 4.1. (Module Border Bases and Special Generation) *The $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ if and only if the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.*

- A_1) *For every vector $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$, there exist polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_\nu \in P$ such that*
$$\mathcal{V} = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu$$
and
$$\deg(p_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$
for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ with $p_j \neq 0$.
- A_2) *For every vector $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$, there exist polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_\nu \in P$ such that*
$$\mathcal{V} = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu$$
and
$$\max\{\deg(p_j) \mid j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}, p_j \neq 0\} = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1.$$

Proof. In order to show that A_1) holds if $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$, we let $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$. We apply the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ to obtain a representation
$$\mathcal{V} = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu + c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}$$
with $p_1, \dots, p_\nu \in P$, $c_1, \dots, c_\mu \in K$, and
$$\deg(p_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$
for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ with $p_j \neq 0$. As $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$, this yields
$$\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle = \mathcal{V} + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle = c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \in P^r / \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle.$$
Hence Definition 2.13 yields $c_1 = \cdots = c_\mu = 0$ as $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ and the claim follows.

Next we prove that A_1) implies A_2). Let $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$ and let
$$\mathcal{V} = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu$$
with $p_1, \dots, p_\nu \in P$ and
$$\deg(p_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$
for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ where $p_j \neq 0$ like in A_1). If
$$\deg(p_j) < \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$
for some $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$, Proposition 2.12 yields
$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(p_j \mathcal{G}_j) \leq \deg(p_j) + \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{G}_j) = \deg(p_j) + 1 < \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}).$$
Moreover, Proposition 2.12 also yields
$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) \leq \max\{\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(p_j \mathcal{G}_j) \mid j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}, p_j \neq 0\} \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}).$$
Altogether, we see that there has to be at least one index $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ such that $p_j \neq 0$ and $\deg(p_j) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$.

At last, we show that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ if A_2) holds. Let $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. Assume that $\mathcal{V} \neq 0$. Then A_2) yields the existence of $p_1, \ldots, p_\nu \in P$ such that

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu$$

and

$$\deg(p_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1 = -1$$

for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ where $p_j \neq 0$. Thus we have $p_1 = \cdots = p_\nu = 0$ and this yields the contradiction $\mathcal{V} = 0$. Altogether, we have $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K = \{0\}$ and the claim follows with Corollary 2.19. □

Next we show the connection of module border bases and their border form modules. The characterization of module border bases again is a straightforward generalization of the concept of the border form of border bases like it has originally been proven in [KK05, Prop. 11]. We follow the corresponding definition of the border form of a vector in [KR05, Defn. 6.4.24] and the corresponding characterization in [KR05, Prop. 6.4.25].

Definition 4.2. a) Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r \setminus \{0\}$. We write

$$\mathcal{V} = a_1 u_1 e_{i_1} + \cdots + a_s u_s e_{i_s}$$

with $a_1, \ldots, a_s \in K \setminus \{0\}$, $u_1 e_{i_1}, \ldots, u_s e_{i_s} \in \mathbb{T}^n \langle e_1, \ldots, e_r \rangle$ and

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(u_1 e_{i_1}) \geq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(u_2 e_{i_2}) \geq \cdots \geq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(u_s e_{i_s}).$$

Then we call the vector

$$\operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) = \sum_{\substack{j \in \{1, \ldots, s\} \\ \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(u_j e_{i_j}) = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V})}} a_j u_j e_{i_j} \in P^r$$

the **border form** of $\mathcal{V}$ with respect to $\mathcal{M}$.

b) Let $U \subseteq P^r$ be a P-submodule. Then we call the P-submodule

$$\operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(U) = \langle \operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) \mid \mathcal{V} \in U \setminus \{0\} \rangle \subseteq P^r$$

the **border form module** of U with respect to $\mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 4.3. (Module Border Bases and Border Form Modules) *The $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ if and only if the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.*

B_1) *For every $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$, we have*

$$\operatorname{Supp}(\operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V})) \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n \langle e_1, \ldots, e_r \rangle \setminus \mathcal{M}.$$

B_2) *We have*

$$\operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle) = \langle \operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{G}_1), \ldots, \operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{G}_\nu) \rangle = \langle b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu} \rangle.$$

Proof. We start with the proof that condition B_1) is satisfied if $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. Let $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that $\operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V})$ contains a term of $\mathcal{M}$ in its support. Then we have $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) = 0$ and thus

$$\mathcal{V} = \operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) \subseteq \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$$

by Definition 4.2. Now Corollary 2.19 yields the contradiction

$$\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K = \{0\}.$$

Thus $\operatorname{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V})$ does not contain a term of $\mathcal{M}$ in its support, and the claim follows.

Next we show that B_1) implies B_2). Since $\mathcal{G}_j \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$, we see that we have

$$\mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{G}_j) = b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle)$$

for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. To prove the converse inclusion, we let $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$. Then we have

$$\mathrm{Supp}(\mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V})) \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n \langle e_1, \ldots, e_r \rangle \setminus \mathcal{M}$$

by B_1). Thus Definition 4.2 and Proposition 2.7 yield that every term in the support of $\mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V})$ is divisible by a term in $\partial\mathcal{M} = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}\}$. Thus we see that

$$\mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu} \rangle.$$

Finally, we prove that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ if B_2) is satisfied. Assume that there exists a vector $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \setminus \{0\}$. Then we have $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) = 0$ and as a consequence we see that

$$\mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{V} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K.$$

Condition B_2) and Proposition 2.7 now yield the contradiction $\mathcal{V} = 0$. Altogether, the claim follows with Corollary 2.19. ☐

We now define a rewrite relation corresponding to $\mathcal{G}$ and characterize module border bases with it. For border bases, the analogous version has originally been proven in [KK05, Prop. 14]. Like for the previous characterizations, our definition of rewrite rules and the first proposition about it are straightforward generalizations of the corresponding ones for border bases in [KR05, p. 432], [KR05, Remark 6.4.27], and respectively in [KR00, Prop. 2.2.2].

Definition 4.4. a) Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, and let $te_k \in \mathrm{Supp}(\mathcal{V})$ such that there exists a factorization

$$te_k = t' b_j e_{\beta_j}$$

with $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. Let $c \in K$ be the coefficient of te_k in $\mathcal{V}$. Then the vector $\mathcal{V} - ct'\mathcal{G}_j \in P^r$ does not contain the term te_k in its support anymore. We say that $\mathcal{V}$ **reduces to** $\mathcal{V} - ct'\mathcal{G}_j$ **in one step** using the **rewrite rule** $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_j}$ defined by $\mathcal{G}_j$ and write

$$\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_j} \mathcal{V} - ct'\mathcal{G}_j.$$

The passage from $\mathcal{V}$ to $\mathcal{V} - ct'\mathcal{G}_j$ is also called a **reduction step** using $\mathcal{G}_j$.

b) The reflexive, transitive closure of the rewrite rules $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_j}$ defined by $\mathcal{G}_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ is called the **rewrite relation** associated to $\mathcal{G}$ and is denoted by $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$.

c) The equivalence relation generated by $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ is denoted by $\xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$.

Proposition 4.5. a) *If $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in P^r$ satisfy $\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2$, and if $c \in K$ and $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$, then we have $ct\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} ct\mathcal{V}_2$.*

b) *If $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in P^r$ satisfy $\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_j} \mathcal{V}_2$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$, and if $\mathcal{V}_3 \in P^r$, then there exists a vector $\mathcal{V}_4 \in P^r$ such that $\mathcal{V}_1 + \mathcal{V}_3 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_4$ and $\mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_3 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_4$.*

c) *If $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3, \mathcal{V}_4 \in P^r$ satisfy $\mathcal{V}_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2$ and $\mathcal{V}_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_4$, then we have $\mathcal{V}_1 + \mathcal{V}_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_4$.*

d) *If $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in P^r$ satisfy $\mathcal{V}_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2$, and if $p \in P$, then we have $p\mathcal{V}_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} p\mathcal{V}_2$.*

e) *For a vector $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, we have $\mathcal{V} \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$.*

f) *For vectors $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in P^r$, we have $\mathcal{V}_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2$ if and only if $\mathcal{V}_1 - \mathcal{V}_2 \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$.*

Proof. Firstly, we prove a). Let $c \in K$ and $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$. If $c = 0$, nothing has to be shown. Thus we suppose $c \neq 0$. By induction it suffices to prove the claim for a single reduction step using $\mathcal{G}_j$ where $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Let $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in P^r$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ be such that $\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_j} \mathcal{V}_2$. Then Definition 4.4 yields the existence of a term $\hat{t}e_{\beta_j} \in \operatorname{Supp}(\mathcal{V}_1)$, a term $t' \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and a coefficient $c' \in K$ such that $\mathcal{V}_2 = \mathcal{V}_1 - c't'\mathcal{G}_j$ does not contain the term $\hat{t}e_{\beta_j} = t'b_je_{\beta_j}$ in its support anymore. Therefore $ct\mathcal{V}_2 = ct\mathcal{V}_1 - ctc't'\mathcal{G}_j$ does also not contain the term $t\hat{t}e_{\beta_j} = tt'b_je_{\beta_j}$ in its support anymore, i. e. we have $ct\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_j} ct\mathcal{V}_2$ by Definition 4.4.

Secondly, we show b). We let $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3 \in P^r$ be such that $\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_j} \mathcal{V}_2$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. According to Definition 4.4, there exist a term $tb_je_{\beta_j} \in \operatorname{Supp}(\mathcal{V}_1)$ with $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and a coefficient $c \in K \setminus \{0\}$ such that we have $\mathcal{V}_2 = \mathcal{V}_1 - ct\mathcal{G}_j$ and such that $\mathcal{V}_2$ does not contain the term $tb_je_{\beta_j}$ in its support anymore. Let $c' \in K$ be the coefficient of $tb_je_{\beta_j}$ in $\mathcal{V}_3$. We distinguish two cases. If $c' = -c$, we have

$$\mathcal{V}_1 + \mathcal{V}_3 = \mathcal{V}_2 + ct\mathcal{G}_j + \mathcal{V}_3 = \mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_3 - c't\mathcal{G}_j$$

and $\mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_3 - c't\mathcal{G}_j$ does not contain the term $tb_je_{\beta_j}$ in its support anymore, i. e. we have $\mathcal{V}_1 + \mathcal{V}_3 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_j} \mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_3$. The claim now follows with $\mathcal{V}_4 = \mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_3$. If $c' \neq -c$, we define

$$\mathcal{V}_4 = \mathcal{V}_1 + \mathcal{V}_3 - (c + c')t\mathcal{G}_j = \mathcal{V}_2 + ct\mathcal{G}_j + \mathcal{V}_3 - (c + c')t\mathcal{G}_j = \mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_3 - c't\mathcal{G}_j.$$

Then we see that $\mathcal{V}_4$ does not contain the term $tb_je_{\beta_j}$ in its support anymore and thus the claim follows.

For the proof of c), we let $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_4 \in P^r$ be such that $\mathcal{V}_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} V_2$ and such that $\mathcal{V}_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_4$. Then Definition 4.4 yields the existence of vectors $\mathcal{V}'_0, \dots, \mathcal{V}'_k \in P^r$ satisfying $\mathcal{V}'_0 = \mathcal{V}_1$, $\mathcal{V}'_k = \mathcal{V}_2$, and $\mathcal{V}'_{\ell-1} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_{i_\ell}} \mathcal{V}'_\ell$ or $\mathcal{V}'_{\ell-1} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{G}_{i_\ell}} \mathcal{V}'_\ell$ where $i_\ell \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. According to b), for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, there exist vectors $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}'_\ell \in P^r$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{V}'_{\ell-1} + \mathcal{V}_3 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \tilde{\mathcal{V}}'_\ell \xleftarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}'_\ell + \mathcal{V}_3.$$

Therefore, for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we have

$$\mathcal{V}'_{\ell-1} + \mathcal{V}_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}'_\ell + \mathcal{V}_3$$

and induction over $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ yields

$$\mathcal{V}_1 + \mathcal{V}_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_3.$$

by Definition 4.4. An analogous construction yields the claim

$$\mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_4 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2 + \mathcal{V}_3 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_1 + \mathcal{V}_3.$$

In order to show d), let $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in P^r$ be such that $\mathcal{V}_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2$ and let

$$p = c_1u_1 + \dots + c_su_s \in P$$

be with coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_s \in K$ and terms $u_1, \dots, u_s \in \mathbb{T}^n$. Then we have

$$c_iu_i\mathcal{V}_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} c_iu_i\mathcal{V}_2$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ by a). Induction over $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and c) now yield the claim

$$p\mathcal{V}_1 = c_1u_1\mathcal{V}_1 + \dots + c_su_s\mathcal{V}_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} c_1u_1\mathcal{V}_2 + \dots + c_su_s\mathcal{V}_2 = p\mathcal{V}_2.$$

We go on with the proof of the equivalence e). Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$. If $\mathcal{V} \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$, we collect the monomials used in the various reduction steps and get polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_\nu \in P$ such that

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle.$$

For the converse implication, suppose that $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. Then there exist polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_\nu \in P$ such that

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle.$$

Obviously, we have $\mathcal{G}_j \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$ by Definition 4.4 and thus d) yields $p_j\mathcal{G}_j \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Therefore, induction over $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ together with claim c) shows

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0.$$

Finally, we show the equivalence in f). Let $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \in P^r$. We have $\mathcal{V} \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}$ for all $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$ by Definition 4.4. In particular, we see that $-\mathcal{V}_2 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} -\mathcal{V}_2$. Thus the condition $\mathcal{V}_1 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2$ is equivalent to the condition $\mathcal{V}_1 - \mathcal{V}_2 \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2 - \mathcal{V}_2 = 0$ by c). We now see that the claim is a direct consequence of e). ☐

Next we define irreducible vectors and confluent and Noetherian rewrite rules associated to a module border prebasis in the usual way, cf. [KR05, pp. 432–433]. Using Proposition 4.5, we can then characterize module border bases via confluent rewrite rules as it has been done for border bases in [KR05, Prop. 6.4.28].

Definition 4.6.

a) A vector $\mathcal{V}_1 \in P^r$ is called **irreducible** with respect to the rewrite relation $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ if there exist no $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ and no $\mathcal{V}_2 \in P^r \setminus \{\mathcal{V}_1\}$ such that $\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_j} \mathcal{V}_2$.

b) The rewrite rule $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ is called **Noetherian** if there exists no infinitely descending chain

$$\mathcal{V}_0 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_{i_1}} \mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_{i_2}} \mathcal{V}_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_{i_3}} \cdots$$

with $i_j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$, $\mathcal{V}_j \in P^r \setminus \{\mathcal{V}_{j-1}\}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, and $\mathcal{V}_0 \in P^r$.

c) The rewrite rule $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ is called **confluent** if for all vectors $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3 \in P^r$ satisfying $\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2$ and $\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_3$, there exists a vector $\mathcal{V}_4 \in P^r$ such that $\mathcal{V}_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_4$ and $\mathcal{V}_3 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_4$.

Remark 4.7.

a) For $r = 1$, module border bases coincide with the usual border bases. Thus [KR05, Exmp. 6.4.26] shows that the rewrite relation $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ is not Noetherian, in general.

b) A vector $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$ is irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ if and only if $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$ according to Definition 2.4 and Definition 4.6.

c) Considering the steps of the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 in detail, we see that it performs reduction steps using $\mathcal{G}_j$ where $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ to compute the normal remainder of a given vector. Thus for every $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, we have $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V})$. In particular, $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$ is irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$.

Theorem 4.8. (Module Border Bases and Rewrite Rules) *The $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ if and only if the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.*

C_1) *For all $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, we have $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$.*

C_2) *If $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ is irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$, then we have $\mathcal{V} = 0$.*

C_3) *For all $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, there is a unique vector $\mathcal{W} \in P^r$ such that $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{W}$ and such that $\mathcal{W}$ is irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$.*

C_4) *The rewrite relation $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ is confluent.*

Proof. We start to show that C_1) implies C_2). Let $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ be irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$. As we have $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$ by C_1), $\mathcal{V}$ must be zero.

Next we show that C_2) implies C_3). Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$. According to Remark 4.7, $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V})$ is a vector with the claimed properties. In order to show the uniqueness, we let $\mathcal{W} \in P^r$ be irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ and satisfying $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{W}$. Then we see that $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{W}$ by Definition 4.4 and it follows $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) - \mathcal{W} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ according to Proposition 4.5. Additionally, Remark 4.7 yields that $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) - \mathcal{W} \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$ is irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$. Thus the claim follows from C_2).

In order to prove that C_3) implies C_4), we let $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_3 \in P^r$ be satisfying $\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2$ and $\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_3$. According to Remark 4.7, we see that

$$\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}_2) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_3 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}_3) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K,$$

and that both $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}_2)$ and $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}_3)$ are irreducible with respect to the rewrite relation $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$. Thus C_3) implies the equality $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}_2) = \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}_3)$ and the claim follows by Definition 4.6.

We go on with the proof that C_4) implies C_1). Let $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$ be satisfying $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$. Then Proposition 4.5 yields $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. For the converse implication, we let $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. Then Proposition 4.5 yields $\mathcal{V} \xleftrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$. Let $\mathcal{V}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{V}_k \in P^r$ be such that $\mathcal{V}_0 = \mathcal{V}$, $\mathcal{V}_k = 0$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\ell-1} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_\ell$ or $\mathcal{V}_{\ell-1} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_\ell$ for all $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. If there exists no index $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $\mathcal{V}_{\ell-1} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_\ell$, the claim follows immediately with Definition 4.4. Thus suppose that $\mathcal{V}_{\ell-1} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_\ell$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. By Definition 4.4, we see that $\mathcal{V}_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_k = 0$. Let $s \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ be maximal such that $\mathcal{V}_{s-1} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_s$. Then we have $\mathcal{V}_s \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$, $\mathcal{V}_s \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_{s-1}$, and C_4) yields $\mathcal{V}_{s-1} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$. If we replace the sequence $\mathcal{V}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{V}_{k-1}, 0$ with the shorter sequence $\mathcal{V}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{V}_{s-1}, 0$, we see that the claim follows by induction over the number of reduction steps $\mathcal{V}_{\ell-1} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{V}_\ell$ where $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

Next we show that condition C_1) is satisfied if $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. If a vector $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$ satisfies $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$, we have $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ by Proposition 4.5. Conversely, let $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. Then it follows that $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$ by Remark 4.7. Since $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$, we also have $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ according to Definition 4.4. Hence the claim follows as Corollary 2.19 yields $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K = \{0\}$.

Finally, we prove that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ if C_2) holds. Assume there exists a $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \setminus \{0\}$. Then $\mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) = 0$ and therefore $\mathcal{V}$ is irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ according to Remark 4.7. Thus C_2) yields the contradiction $\mathcal{V} = 0$ and the claim follows with Corollary 2.19. □

We go on with the characterization of module border bases via commuting matrices. This characterization imitates the corresponding characterization for border bases originally published in [KK05, Prop. 16] and [KK05, pp. 13–15]. Our generalization to the module setting follows the corresponding versions of border bases in [KR05, Defn. 6.4.29], [KR05, Thm. 6.4.30], and [KR05, Prop. 6.4.32]. To ease the notation, we let

$$\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$$

denote the Kronecker delta and $\mathfrak{I}_\mu \in \operatorname{Mat}_\mu(K)$ denote the identity matrix for the remainder of this section.

Definition 4.9. Given $s \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we define the s^{th} **formal multiplication matrix**

$$\mathfrak{X}_s = \big(\xi_{k\ell}^{(s)}\big)_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq \mu} \in \operatorname{Mat}_\mu(K)$$

of $\mathcal{G}$ by

$$\xi_{k\ell}^{(s)} = \begin{cases} \delta_{ki} & \text{if } x_s t_\ell e_{\alpha_\ell} = t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \mathcal{M}, \\ c_{kj} & \text{if } x_s t_\ell e_{\alpha_\ell} = b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}. \end{cases}$$

Example 4.10. We consider the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G} \subseteq P^2$ from Example 2.16, again. Recall, that

$$\mathcal{M} = \{xe_1, ye_1, e_1, x^2e_2, xe_2, e_2\} = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \dots, t_6 e_{\alpha_6}\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_1 &= x^2e_1 - ye_1 + e_2, \\ \mathcal{G}_2 &= xye_1 - e_2, \\ \mathcal{G}_3 &= y^2e_1 - xe_2, \\ \mathcal{G}_4 &= x^3e_2 - e_1, \\ \mathcal{G}_5 &= x^2ye_2 - e_1 - e_2, \\ \mathcal{G}_6 &= xye_2 + 3e_1, \\ \mathcal{G}_7 &= ye_2 - xe_1 - ye_1 - e_1 - e_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then the formal multiplication matrices $\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{Y} \in \operatorname{Mat}_7(\mathbb{Q})$ of $\mathcal{G}$ are

$$\mathfrak{X} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathfrak{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Remark 4.11. Similar to the interpretation of the formal multiplication matrices of a border prebasis in [KR05, Page 434], we can interpret the multiplication matrices of the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebases $\mathcal{G}$ the following way: Let $s \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and let $\mathfrak{X}_s \in \operatorname{Mat}_\mu(K)$ be the s^{th} formal multiplication matrix of $\mathcal{G}$. We can identify every vector

$$\mathcal{V} = c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \subseteq P^r$$

with the corresponding column vector

$$(c_1, \dots, c_\mu)^{\text{tr}} \in K^\mu.$$

Then the column vector

$$(c_1', \dots, c_\mu') = \mathfrak{X}_s (c_1, \dots, c_\mu)^{\text{tr}} \in K^\mu$$

corresponds to the vector

$$c_1' t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu' t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} = \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(x_s \mathcal{V}) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \subseteq P^r.$$

In particular, we have

$$c_1' t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu' t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle = x_s \mathcal{V} + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle.$$

Lemma 4.12. *Assume that $\mu \neq 0$, i. e. $\mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$. Let $\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n \in \mathrm{Mat}_\mu(K)$ be the formal multiplication matrices of $\mathcal{G}$ and assume that $\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n$ are pairwise commuting. Then the K-vector subspace $\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \subseteq P^r$ is a P-module with scalar multiplication $\circ : P \times \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \to \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$ defined by*

$$p \circ (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) = (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) p(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}}$$

for all $p \in P$ and all $c_1, \ldots, c_\mu \in K$. Moreover, the set $\{e_1, \ldots, e_r\} \cap \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ generates $\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$ as a P-module.

Proof. As $\mathcal{M}$ is K-linearly independent, the map $\circ$ is well-defined. Moreover, the K-vector subspace $\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \subseteq P^r$ is obviously an additive group. Since the formal multiplication matrices $\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n \in \mathrm{Mat}_\mu(K)$ are pairwise commuting, for all polynomials $p, q \in P$ and all coefficients $c_1, \ldots, c_\mu, d_1, \ldots, d_\mu \in K$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&1 \circ (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \mathfrak{I}_\mu (c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&(pq) \circ (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})(pq)(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) p(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n) q(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= p \circ ((t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) q(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}}) \\
&= p \circ (q \circ (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&(p+q) \circ (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})(p+q)(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})(p(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n) + q(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n))(c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) p(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&\quad + (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) q(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= (p \circ (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})) + (q \circ (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&p \circ ((c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) + (d_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + d_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})) \\
&= p \circ ((c_1 + d_1) t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + (c_\mu + d_\mu) t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) p(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(c_1 + d_1, \ldots, c_\mu + d_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) p(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)((c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} + (d_1, \ldots, d_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}}) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) p(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(c_1, \ldots, c_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&\quad + (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) p(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n)(d_1, \ldots, d_\mu)^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= (p \circ (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})) + (p \circ (d_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + d_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})).
\end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we see that that $(\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K, +, \circ)$ is indeed a P-module.

It remains to prove that the P-module $\langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K$ is generated by $\{e_1,\dots,e_r\}\cap\mathcal{M}$. W. l. o. g. we suppose that we have $e_1,\dots,e_\ell\in\mathcal{M}$ and $e_{\ell+1},\dots,e_r\notin\mathcal{M}$ for some $\ell\in\{1,\dots,r\}$, and that $t_k e_{\alpha_k}=e_k$ for all $k\in\{1,\dots,\ell\}$. Let $\{\mathfrak{e}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{e}_\mu\}\subseteq K^\mu$ be the canonical K-vector space basis of K^μ, and let $k\in\{1,\dots,\ell\}$. We prove by induction on degree that $t\circ e_k=te_k$ for all $t\in\mathcal{O}_k$. The induction starts with

$$\begin{aligned}1\circ e_k&=(t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})1(\mathfrak{X}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{X}_n)\mathfrak{e}_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\\&=(t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})\mathfrak{I}_\mu\mathfrak{e}_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\\&=(t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})\mathfrak{e}_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\\&=t_ke_{\alpha_k}\\&=e_k.\end{aligned}$$

For the induction step, suppose that $t\in\mathcal{O}_k$ with $\deg(t)>0$. Then there is a factorization

$$te_k=t_ie_{\alpha_i}=x_st_je_{\alpha_j}$$

with $i,j\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}$ and $s\in\{1,\dots,n\}$ by Definition 2.4. The induction hypothesis yields

$$t\circ e_k=(x_st_j)\circ e_{\alpha_j}=x_s\circ(t_j\circ e_{\alpha_j})=x_s\circ(t_je_{\alpha_k}).$$

Thus we see that

$$\begin{aligned}t\circ e_k&=x_s\circ(t_je_{\alpha_j})\\&=(t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})x_s(\mathfrak{X}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{X}_n)\mathfrak{e}_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\\&=(t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{e}_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\\&=(t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})\big(\xi_{1j}^{(s)},\dots,\xi_{\mu j}^{(s)}\big)^{\mathrm{tr}}\\&=\delta_{1i}t_1e_{\alpha_1}+\dots+\delta_{\mu i}t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\\&=t_ie_{\alpha_i}\\&=te_k,\end{aligned}$$

i. e. the above claim has been proven by induction. For every $c\in K$ and every $i\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}c\circ t_ie_{\alpha_i}&=(t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})c(\mathfrak{X}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{X}_n)\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\\&=(t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})c\mathfrak{I}_\mu\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\\&=(t_1e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu})c\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\\&=ct_ie_{\alpha_i}.\end{aligned}$$

Altogether, since $\{e_1,\dots,e_r\}\cap\mathcal{M}=\{e_1,\dots,e_\ell\}$, we see that

$$(c_1t_1)\circ e_{\alpha_1}+\dots+(c_\mu t_\mu)\circ e_{\alpha_\mu}=c_1t_1e_{\alpha_1}+\dots+c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}$$

for all $c_1,\dots,c_\mu\in K$, i. e. the P-module $\langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K$ is generated by $\{e_1,\dots,e_r\}\cap\mathcal{M}$. □

Theorem 4.13. (Module Border Bases and Commuting Matrices) *For all $s\in\{1,\dots,n\}$, we define the map*

$$\varrho_s:\{1,\dots,\mu\}\to\mathbb{N},\quad i\mapsto\begin{cases}j & \text{if } x_st_ie_{\alpha_i}=t_je_{\alpha_j}\in\mathcal{M},\\ k & \text{if } x_st_ie_{\alpha_i}=b_ke_{\beta_k}\in\partial\mathcal{M}.\end{cases}$$

Then the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ if and only if the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.

- D_1) *The formal multiplication matrices $\mathfrak{X}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{X}_n\in\mathrm{Mat}_\mu(K)$ of $\mathcal{G}$ are pairwise commuting.*

D_2) *The following equations are satisfied for every* $p \in \{1,\dots,\mu\}$ *and for every* $s,u \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ *with* $s \neq u$:

1) *If* $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_j e_{\alpha_j}$, $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_k e_{\beta_k}$, *and* $x_s b_k e_{\beta_k} = b_\ell e_{\beta_\ell}$ *with indices* $i,j \in \{1,\dots,\mu\}$ *and* $k,\ell \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$, *we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} = c_{p\ell}.$$

2) *If* $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_j e_{\beta_j}$ *and* $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_k e_{\beta_k}$ *with indices* $i \in \{1,\dots,\mu\}$ *and* $j,k \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk}\\ &= \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_u(m)} c_{mj} + \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{p\varrho_u(m)} c_{mj}.\end{aligned}$$

If the equivalent conditions are satisfied, for all $s \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, *the formal multiplication matrix* $\mathfrak{X}_s$ *represents the multiplication endomorphism of the* K*-vector space* $P^r/\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ *defined by* $\mathcal{V}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle \mapsto x_s\mathcal{V}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$, *where* $\mathcal{V}\in P^r$, *with respect to the* K*-vector space basis* $\varepsilon_{\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle}(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. If $\mu = 0$, i.e. if $\mathcal{M} = \emptyset$ and $\partial\mathcal{M} = \{e_1,\dots,e_r\} = \mathcal{G}$, the claim is obviously true. Thus suppose that $\mu \neq 0$.

We start with the proof that condition D_1) is satisfied if $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$, i.e. that $\varepsilon_{\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle}(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $P^r/\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ and $\#\varepsilon_{\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle}(\mathcal{M}) = \mu$ by Definition 2.13. Let $s \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. The formal multiplication matrix $\mathfrak{X}_s \in \operatorname{Mat}_\mu(K)$ defines a K-vector space endomorphism ϕ_s of $P^r/\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ with respect to the K-vector space basis $\varepsilon_{\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle}(\mathcal{M})$. We show that $\phi_s(\mathcal{V}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle) = x_s\mathcal{V}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ for all $\mathcal{V}\in P^r/\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$, i.e. ϕ_s is the K-vector space endomorphism corresponding to the multiplication by x_s. Consider the expansions

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_s(t_1e_{\alpha_1}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle) &= \xi^{(s)}_{11}(t_1e_{\alpha_1}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle)+\cdots+\xi^{(s)}_{\mu 1}(t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle),\\ &\ \ \vdots\\ \phi_s(t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle) &= \xi^{(s)}_{1\mu}(t_1e_{\alpha_1}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle)+\cdots+\xi^{(s)}_{\mu\mu}(t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

Let $u \in \{1,\dots,\mu\}$. Then we see that $x_s t_u e_{\alpha_u} \in \overline{\partial\mathcal{M}}$ according to Definition 2.5. We now distinguish two cases. If $x_s t_u e_{\alpha_u} = t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \mathcal{M}$ with $i \in \{1,\dots,\mu\}$, Definition 4.9 yields

$$\phi_s(t_ue_{\alpha_u}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle) = \delta_{1i}t_1e_{\alpha_1}+\cdots+\delta_{\mu i}t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle = t_ie_{\alpha_i}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle = x_st_ue_{\alpha_u}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle.$$

If $x_s t_u e_{\alpha_u} = b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ with $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$, Definition 4.9 yields

$$\phi_s(t_ue_{\alpha_u}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle) = c_{1j}t_1e_{\alpha_1}+\cdots+c_{\mu j}t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle = b_je_{\beta_j}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle = x_st_ue_{\alpha_u}+\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle.$$

Therefore, we see that ϕ_s is the multiplication by x_s for all $s \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. Since the multiplication in $P^r/\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ is commutative, and since the formal multiplication matrices $\mathfrak{X}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{X}_n$ represent the endomorphisms $\phi_1,\dots,\phi_n$, it follows that $\mathfrak{X}_k\mathfrak{X}_\ell = \mathfrak{X}_\ell\mathfrak{X}_k$ for all $k,\ell \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, i.e. the formal multiplication matrices $\mathfrak{X}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{X}_n$ are pairwise commuting.

Next we show that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ if D_1) holds. The maps

$$\{e_1,\dots,e_r\} \to P^r, \quad e_k \mapsto e_k$$

and

$$\{e_1,\ldots,e_r\} \to \langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K, \quad e_k \mapsto \begin{cases} e_k & \text{if } e_k \in \mathcal{M} \\ \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} & \text{if } e_k = e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M} \end{cases}$$

induce the P-module epimorphism

$$\varphi : P^r \twoheadrightarrow \langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K, \quad e_k \mapsto \begin{cases} e_k & \text{if } e_k \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} & \text{if } e_k = e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M} \end{cases}$$

by the Universal Property of the Free Module as $\{e_1,\ldots,e_r\} \cap \mathcal{M}$ generates $\langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K$ as a P-module according to Lemma 4.12. Thus the Isomorphism Theorem induces the P-module isomorphism

$$\overline{\varphi} : P^r/\ker(\varphi) \xrightarrow{\sim} \langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K, \quad e_k + \ker(\varphi) \mapsto \begin{cases} e_k & \text{if } e_k \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} & \text{if } e_k = e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}. \end{cases}$$

In particular, it follows that $\varepsilon_{\ker(\varphi)}(\mathcal{M}) = \overline{\varphi}^{-1}(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $P^r/\ker(\varphi)$ as $\mathcal{M}$ is a K-vector space basis of $\langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K$.
We now show that $\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle \subseteq \ker(\varphi)$. Let $\{\mathfrak{e}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{e}_\mu\} \subseteq K^\mu$ be the canonical K-vector space basis of K^μ. W. l. o. g. we suppose that $e_1,\ldots,e_\ell \in \mathcal{M}$ and $e_{\ell+1},\ldots,e_r \notin \mathcal{M}$ for some $\ell \in \{1,\ldots,r\}$, and that $t_k e_{\alpha_k} = e_k$ for all $k \in \{1,\ldots,\ell\}$. Furthermore, we let $j \in \{1,\ldots,\nu\}$. We have to distinguish two cases.
For the first case, assume that $\mathcal{O}_{\beta_j} = \emptyset$. Then we have $b_j = 1$ and $e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ by Definition 2.5. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(\mathcal{G}_j) &= \varphi\left(b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i}\right) \\
&= b_j \circ \varphi(e_{\beta_i}) - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (c_{ij} t_i) \circ \varphi(e_{\alpha_i}) \\
&= 1 \circ \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} \circ (t_i \circ e_{\alpha_i}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (t_1 e_{\alpha_1},\ldots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) c_{ij} t_i (\mathfrak{X}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{X}_n) \mathfrak{e}_{\alpha_i}^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (t_1 e_{\alpha_1},\ldots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) c_{ij} \mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second case, assume that $\mathcal{O}_{\beta_j} \neq \emptyset$. Then $\deg(b_j) \geq 1$ and $e_{\beta_j} \in \mathcal{M}$ by Definition 2.5. Then there exist an $s \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ and a $k \in \{1,\ldots,\mu\}$ such that

$b_j e_{\beta_j} = x_s t_k e_{\alpha_k}$ and we have $\beta_j = \alpha_k$ by Definition 2.5. Thus we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(\mathcal{G}_j) &= \varphi\left(b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} \right) \\
&= b_j \circ \varphi(e_{\beta_j}) - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (c_{ij} t_i) \circ \varphi(e_{\alpha_i}) \\
&= b_j \circ e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} \circ (t_i \circ e_{\alpha_i}) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \left(b_j(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n) \mathfrak{e}^{\mathrm{tr}}_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n) \mathfrak{e}^{\mathrm{tr}}_{\alpha_i} \right) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \left(\mathfrak{X}_s t_k(\mathfrak{X}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{X}_n) \mathfrak{e}^{\mathrm{tr}}_{\alpha_k} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} \mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} \right) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \left(\mathfrak{X}_s \mathfrak{e}_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} \mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} \right) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\mu} \xi_{ij}^{(s)} \mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} \mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} \right) \\
&= (t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} \mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} \mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} \right) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Altogether, it follows that $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \subseteq \ker(\varphi)$.
The Universal Property of the Residue Class Module now induces the P-module epimorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi : P^r / \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle &\twoheadrightarrow P^r / \ker(\varphi) \\
e_k + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle &\mapsto \begin{cases} e_k + \ker(\varphi) & \text{if } e_k \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} + \ker(\varphi) & \text{if } e_k = e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have $\psi(\varepsilon_{\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle}(\mathcal{M})) = \varepsilon_{\ker(\varphi)}(\mathcal{M})$. Since $\varepsilon_{\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle}(\mathcal{M})$ also generates the K-vector space $P^r / \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ by Corollary 2.18 and since $\varepsilon_{\ker(\varphi)}(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $P^r / \ker(\varphi)$, we see that $\varepsilon_{\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle}(\mathcal{M})$ is also a K-vector space basis of $P^r / \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. In particular, we have

$$\mu \geq \# \varepsilon_{\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle}(\mathcal{M}) \geq \# \varepsilon_{\ker(\varphi)}(\mathcal{M}) = \# \overline{\varphi}^{-1}(\mathcal{M}) = \# \mathcal{M} = \mu.$$

Altogether, it follows that $\# \varepsilon_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M}) = \mu$ and Definition 2.13 yields that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$.

Finally, we show that D_1) is equivalent to D_2). Let $p, i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$, and let $s, u \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $s \neq u$. In order to show this equivalence, we translate the commutativity condition $\mathfrak{e}_p \mathfrak{X}_s \mathfrak{X}_u \mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathfrak{e}_p \mathfrak{X}_u \mathfrak{X}_s \mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$ back into the language of $\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. As the resulting condition depends on the position of $t_i e_{\beta_i}$ relative to the border of $\mathcal{M}$, we distinguish four cases.

$t_k e_{\alpha_k}$	$t_\ell e_{\alpha_\ell}$
$t_i e_{\alpha_i}$	$t_j e_{\alpha_j}$

First case: $x_s x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \mathcal{M}$

Since $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module, we also see that we have $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i}, x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \mathcal{M}$. Say, $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_j e_{\alpha_j}$, $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_k e_{\alpha_k}$, and $x_s x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_\ell e_{\alpha_\ell}$ where $j, k, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$.

Then we have

$$\mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{e}_k^{\mathrm{tr}} = \xi_{pk}^{(s)} = \delta_{p\ell} = \xi_{pj}^{(u)} = \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{e}_j^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}},$$

i. e. the commutativity condition holds in this case by Definition 4.9.

$t_k e_{\alpha_k}$	$b_\ell e_{\beta_\ell}$
$t_i e_{\alpha_i}$	$t_j e_{\alpha_j}$

Second case: $x_s x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ and $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i}, x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \mathcal{M}$

Say, $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_j e_{\alpha_j}$, $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_k e_{\alpha_k}$, and $x_s x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_\ell e_{\beta_\ell}$ where $j,k \in \{1,\dots,\mu\}$ and $\ell \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$. Then we have

$$\mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{e}_k^{\mathrm{tr}} = \xi_{pk}^{(s)} = c_{p\ell} = \xi_{pj}^{(u)} = \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{e}_j^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}},$$

i. e. the commutativity condition holds in this case by Definition 4.9, again.

$b_k e_{\beta_k}$	$b_\ell e_{\beta_\ell}$
$t_i e_{\alpha_i}$	$t_j e_{\alpha_j}$

Third case: $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$

Since $\overline{\partial\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ are order modules, we see that $x_s x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ by Definition 2.4 and Definition 2.5. Say, $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_j e_{\alpha_j}$, $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_k e_{\beta_k}$, and $x_s x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_\ell e_{\beta_\ell}$ where $j \in \{1,\dots,\mu\}$ and $k,\ell \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} &= \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_s(c_{1k},\dots,c_{\mu k})^{\mathrm{tr}}\\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} \xi_{pm}^{(s)} c_{mk}\\ &= \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{e}_j^{\mathrm{tr}} = \xi_{pj}^{(u)} = c_{p\ell}$$

by Definition 4.9. Thus the commutativity condition holds in this case if and only if equation (1) is satisfied for s, u and p.

$b_k e_{\beta_k}$	$*$
$t_i e_{\alpha_i}$	$b_j e_{\beta_j}$

Fourth case: $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ and $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$

Say, $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_j e_{\beta_j}$ and $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_k e_{\beta_k}$ where $j,k \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} &= \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_s(c_{1k},\dots,c_{\mu k})^{\mathrm{tr}}\\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} \xi_{pm}^{(s)} c_{mk}\\ &= \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_u\mathfrak{X}_s\mathfrak{e}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} &= \mathfrak{e}_p\mathfrak{X}_u(c_{1j},\dots,c_{\mu j})^{\mathrm{tr}}\\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} \xi_{pm}^{(u)} c_{mj}\\ &= \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_u(m)} c_{mj} + \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{p\varrho_u(m)} c_{mj}.\end{aligned}$$

by Definition 4.9. Thus the commutativity condition holds in this case if and only if equation (2) is satisfied for s, u and p.

Altogether, we have regarded all possible cases and have seen that condition $D_1)$

holds if and only if, the equations (1) and (2) are satisfied for all $s, u \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $s \neq u$ and all $p \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$, i. e. if and only if $D_2)$ is satsfied. $\square$

Example 4.14. We consider Example 4.10, again. We have seen that the formal multiplication matrices $\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{Y} \in \operatorname{Mat}_7(\mathbb{Q})$ of $\mathcal{G}$ are

$$\mathfrak{X} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathfrak{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since

$$\mathfrak{X} \cdot \mathfrak{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \mathfrak{Y} \cdot \mathfrak{X},$$

condition $D_1)$ of Theorem 4.13 yields that $\mathcal{G}$ is not the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$.

The next characterization shows the connection of module border bases and the existence of liftings of border syzygies. The definitions and proofs of this characterization follow the corresponding ones for border bases in [KK05, Section 5].

We now investigate the connection of $\mathcal{M}$-module border bases and special syzygy modules. Recall, that we call $(p_1, \dots, p_s) \in P^s$ a syzygy of $(\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_s) \in (P^r)^s$ if $p_1\mathcal{V}_1 + \cdots + p_s\mathcal{V}_s = 0$ holds. For a vector $(\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_s) \in (P^r)^s$, the set of all syzygies of $(\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_s)$ is a P-submodule of P^s and is denoted by $\operatorname{Syz}_P(\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_s)$.

Definition 4.15. A syzygy $(q_1, \dots, q_\nu) \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}) \subseteq P^\nu$ is called a **border syzygy** with respect to $\mathcal{M}$.

We have defined module border bases over the free P-module P^r with its canonical P-module basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_r\} \subseteq P^r$. Since border syzygies with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ are vectors in the free P-module P^ν, we must distinguish these two free modules. In order to make this distinction easier, we let $\{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_\nu\} \subseteq P^\nu$ denote the canonical P-module basis of P^ν. To shorten notation, we let

$$\sigma_{ij} = \tfrac{\operatorname{lcm}(b_i, b_j)}{b_i} \varepsilon_i - \tfrac{\operatorname{lcm}(b_i, b_j)}{b_j} \varepsilon_j$$

for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Then σ_{ij} is a fundamental syzygies of $(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ such that $\beta_i = \beta_j$ and [KR00, Thm. 2.3.7] yields that the set

$$\{\sigma_{ij} \mid i, j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}, i < j, \beta_i = \beta_j\}.$$

is a generating system of the P-submodule $\operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}) \subseteq P^r$. We now determine an even smaller generating system. But before that, we have to generalize the concepts of neighbors and neighbor syzygies from [KK05, Defn. 17/20]

Definition 4.16. Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ with $i \neq j$.

a) The border terms $b_i e_{\beta_i}, b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ are called **next-door neighbors** with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ if $\beta_i = \beta_j$ and if $b_i, b_j \in \partial\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$ are next-door neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$, i. e. if we have

$$x_k b_i e_{\beta_i} = b_j e_{\beta_j}$$

for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. In this case, the fundamental syzygy

$$\sigma_{ij} = x_k \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$$

is called a **next-door neighbor syzygy** with respect to $\mathcal{M}$.

b) The border terms $b_i e_{\beta_i}, b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \mathcal{M}$ are called **across-the-street neighbors** with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ if $\beta_i = \beta_j$ and if $b_i, b_j \in \partial\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$ are across-the-street neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$, i. e. if we have

$$x_k b_i e_{\beta_i} = x_\ell b_j e_{\beta_j}$$

for some $k, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. In this case, the fundamental syzygy

$$\sigma_{ij} = x_k \varepsilon_i - x_\ell \varepsilon_j \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$$

is called an **across-the-street neighbor syzygy** with respect to $\mathcal{M}$.

c) The border terms $b_i e_{\beta_i}, b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \mathcal{M}$ are called **neighbors** with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ if $\beta_i = \beta_j$ and if $b_i, b_j \in \partial\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$ are neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$, i. e. if they are next-door or across-the-street neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. In this case, the fundamental syzygy $\sigma_{ij} \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$ is called a **neighbor syzygy** with respect to $\mathcal{M}$.

Example 4.17. We proceed with Example 4.14 and determine the neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. Recall, that the border of $\mathcal{M}$ was

$$\partial\mathcal{M} = \{x^2 e_1, xy e_1, y^2 e_1, x^3 e_2, x^2 y e_2, xy e_2, y e_2\}.$$

We see that $x \cdot xy e_2 = x^2 y e_2$, $x \cdot y e_2 = xy e_2$, i. e. the border terms $xy e_2$ and $x^2 y e_2$ and the border terms $y e_2$ and $xy e_2$ are next-door neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. Moreover, we have $y \cdot x^2 e_1 = x \cdot xy e_1$, $y \cdot xy e_1 = x \cdot y^2 e_1$ and $y \cdot x^3 e_2 = x \cdot x^2 y e_2$, i. e. the border terms $x^2 e_1$ and $xy e_1$, the border terms $xy e_1$ and $y^2 e_1$, and the border terms $x^3 e_2$ and $x^2 y e_2$ are across-the-street neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. Obviously, there are no further neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$.

Now we prove an analogous version of [KK05, Prop. 21] for the border syzyigies with respect to $\mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 4.18. *The set of all neighbor syzygies with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ generates the P-submodule $\operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}) \subseteq P^\nu$.*

Proof. As previously mentioned, [KR00, Thm. 2.3.7] yields that the P-submodule $\operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}) \subseteq P^\nu$ is generated by the set

$$\{\sigma_{ij} \mid i, j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}, i < j, \beta_i = \beta_j\}.$$

Let $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ be with $i < j$ and $\beta_i = \beta_j$. We prove that the fundamental syzygy $\sigma_{ij} \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$ is a P-linear combination of neighbor syzygies with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. Let $b_{ij} = \frac{\operatorname{lcm}(b_i, b_j)}{b_i}$ and $b_{ji} = \frac{\operatorname{lcm}(b_i, b_j)}{b_j}$. Since $\beta_i = \beta_j$, we see that $b_i, b_j \in \partial\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$ and that $\sigma_{ij} = b_{ij}\varepsilon_i - b_{ji}\varepsilon_j$ is a syzygy of $(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$ if and only if σ_{ij} is a syzygy of $(b_1, \ldots, b_\nu)$. Moreover, [KK05, Prop. 21] yields that σ_{ij} is a P-linear combination of fundamental syzygies $\sigma_{k\ell}$ such that $k, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$, $b_k, b_\ell \in \partial\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$, i. e. $\beta_k = \beta_\ell = \beta_i$, and such that $b_k, b_\ell \in \partial\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$ are neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$. Furthermore, we see that two border terms $b_k, b_\ell \in \partial\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$ with $k, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ are neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{\beta_i}$ if and only if $b_k e_{\beta_i}$ and $b_\ell e_{\beta_i}$ are neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ by Definition 4.16. Altogether, it follows that the fundamental syzygy σ_{ij} is also a P-linear combination of neighbor syzygies $\sigma_{k\ell}$ such that $k, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ and $b_k e_{\beta_k}$ is a neighbor of $b_\ell e_{\beta_\ell}$ with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. □

We are now able to define liftings of border syzygies with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ similar to [KK05, Defn. 22]. Later, we use liftings to characterize module border basis similar to the corresponding characterization for border bases in [KK05, Prop. 25].

Definition 4.19. Let $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu) \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1},\dots,b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$ be a border syzygy with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. Then we call a syzygy

$$(P_1,\dots,P_\nu) \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_\nu)$$

a **lifting** of $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu)$, if one of the following conditions holds for

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu.$$

1. We have $\mathcal{V} = 0$ and
$$(P_1,\dots,P_\nu) = (p_1,\dots,p_\nu).$$
2. We have $\mathcal{V} \neq 0$ and
$$\deg(P_j - p_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$
for all $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$ such that $P_j - p_j \neq 0$.

In this situation, we also say that the border syzygy $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu)$ with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ **lifts** to the syzygy $(P_1,\dots,P_\nu)$ of $(\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_\nu)$.

Theorem 4.20. (Module Border Bases and Liftings of Border Syzygies) *The $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ if and only if the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.*

- E_1) *Every border syzygy with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ lifts to a syzygy of $(\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_\nu)$.*
- E_2) *Every neighbor syzygy with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ lifts to a syzygy of $(\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_\nu)$.*

Proof. We start to show that condition E_1) is satisfied if $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$. Let

$$(p_1,\dots,p_\nu) \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1},\dots,b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$$

be a border syzygy with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ and let

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu.$$

If $\mathcal{V} = 0$, we see that $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu)$ is a lifting of $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu)$ by Definition 4.19. Thus we suppose that $\mathcal{V} \neq 0$. Since $\mathcal{V} \in \langle\mathcal{G}\rangle \setminus \{0\}$, condition A_1) of Theorem 4.1 yields a representation

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu = q_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + q_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu$$

with $q_1,\dots,q_\nu \in P$ and

$$\deg(q_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$

for all $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$ such that $q_j \neq 0$. Let

$$(P_1,\dots,P_\nu) = (p_1,\dots,p_\nu) - (q_1,\dots,q_\nu).$$

Then $(P_1,\dots,P_\nu)$ is a syzygy of $(\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_\nu)$ by construction. Moreover, we have

$$\deg(P_j - p_j) = \deg(-q_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$

for all $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$ with $P_j - p_j \neq 0$, i. e. $(p_1,\dots,p_\nu)$ lifts to $(P_1,\dots,P_\nu)$ by Definition 4.19.

Since E_1) logically implies E_2) according to Definitions 4.15 and Definition 4.16, it remains to prove that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ if E_2) holds. For all $s \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, we let

$$\varrho_s : \{1,\dots,\mu\} \to \mathbb{N}, \quad i \mapsto \begin{cases} j & \text{if } x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_j e_{\alpha_j} \in \mathcal{M}, \\ k & \text{if } x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_k e_{\beta_k} \in \partial\mathcal{M}. \end{cases}$$

be like in Theorem 4.13. We have to distinguish two cases.
Given next-door neighbors $b_k, b_\ell \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ with respect to $\mathcal{M}$, say

$$x_s b_k e_{\beta_k} = b_\ell e_{\beta_\ell}$$

where $s \in \{1,\dots,n\}$, $k,\ell \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$, and $k \neq \ell$, the corresponding next-door neighbor syzygy with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ is of the form

$$\sigma_{k\ell} = x_s\varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_\ell \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1},\dots,b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$$

by Definition 4.16. If $x_s\mathcal{G}_k - \mathcal{G}_\ell \neq 0$, Definition 4.19 and Proposition 2.12 yield

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(x_s\mathcal{G}_k - \mathcal{G}_\ell) = 1.$$

Let $\lambda_{k\ell}$ be a lifting of $\sigma_{k\ell}$. Then there exist $d_1,\dots,d_\nu \in K$ such that

$$\lambda_{k\ell} = x_s\varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_\ell + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w\varepsilon_w$$

and $\lambda_{k\ell}$ is also a syzygy of $(\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_\nu)$ by Definition 4.19. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= x_s\mathcal{G}_k - \mathcal{G}_\ell + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w\mathcal{G}_w \\
&= x_s\left(b_k e_{\beta_k} - \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mk}t_m e_{\alpha_m}\right) - \left(b_\ell e_{\beta_\ell} - \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{m\ell}t_m e_{\alpha_m}\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w\left(b_w e_{\beta_w} - \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mw}t_m e_{\alpha_m}\right) \\
&= -\sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mk}(x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}) + \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{m\ell}t_m e_{\alpha_m} \\
&\quad + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w b_w e_{\beta_w} - \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mw}t_m e_{\alpha_m} \\
&= -\sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\mathcal{M}}} c_{mk}t_{\varrho_s(m)}e_{\alpha_{\varrho_s(m)}} - \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}\in\partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{mk}b_{\varrho_s(m)}e_{\beta_{\varrho_s(m)}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{m\ell}t_m e_{\alpha_m} + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w b_w e_{\beta_w} - \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mw}t_m e_{\alpha_m}
\end{aligned}$$

As $\partial\mathcal{M}$ is K-linearly independent, comparison of the coefficients of $b_w e_{\beta_w}$ for all $w \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$ yields

$$d_w = \begin{cases} c_{mk} & \text{if } b_w e_{\beta_w} \in x_s\mathcal{M}, \\ 0 & \text{if } b_w e_{\beta_w} \notin x_s\mathcal{M}. \end{cases}$$

As $\mathcal{M}$ is K-linearly independent, comparison of the coefficients of $t_p e_{\alpha_p}$ for all $p \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= - \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\ldots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + c_{p\ell} - \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w c_{pw} \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\ldots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + c_{p\ell} - \sum_{\substack{w\in\{1,\ldots,\nu\}\\ b_w e_{\beta_w} \in x_s\mathcal{M}}} c_{mk} c_{pw} \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\ldots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + c_{p\ell} - \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\ldots,\mu\}\\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{mk} c_{p\varrho_s(m)}, \end{aligned}$$

i. e. the equations (1) of condition D_2) of Theorem 4.13 are satisfied.
Given across-the-street neighbors $b_k, b_\ell \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ with respect to $\mathcal{M}$, say

$$x_s b_k e_{\beta_k} = x_u b_j e_{\beta_j}$$

with $s, u \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $k, j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$, and $k \neq j$, the corresponding across-the-street neighbor syzygy with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ is of the form

$$\sigma_{kj} = x_s \varepsilon_k - x_u \varepsilon_j \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$$

by Definition 4.16. If $x_s \mathcal{G}_k - x_u \mathcal{G}_j \neq 0$, Definition 4.19 and Proposition 2.12 yield

$$\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(x_s \mathcal{G}_k - x_u \mathcal{G}_j) = 1.$$

Let λ_{kj} be a lifting of σ_{kj}. Then there exist $d_1, \ldots, d_\nu \in K$ such that

$$\lambda_{kj} = x_s \varepsilon_k - x_u \varepsilon_j + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w \varepsilon_w,$$

and such that λ_{kj} is also a syzygy of $(\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\nu)$ by to Definition 4.19. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= x_s \mathcal{G}_k - x_u \mathcal{G}_j + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w \mathcal{G}_w \\
&= x_s \left(b_k e_{\beta_k} - \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mk} t_m e_{\alpha_m} \right) - x_u \left(b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mj} t_m e_{\alpha_m} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w \left(b_w e_{\beta_w} - \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mw} t_m e_{\alpha_m} \right) \\
&= -\sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mk} (x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m}) + \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mj} (x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w b_w e_{\beta_w} - \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mw} t_m e_{\alpha_m} \\
&= -\sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} c_{mk} t_{\varrho_s(m)} e_{\alpha_{\varrho_s(m)}} - \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{mk} b_{\varrho_s(m)} e_{\beta_{\varrho_s(m)}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} c_{mj} t_{\varrho_u(m)} e_{\alpha_{\varrho_u(m)}} + \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{mj} b_{\varrho_u(m)} e_{\beta_{\varrho_u(m)}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w b_w e_{\beta_w} - \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w \sum_{m=1}^{\mu} c_{mw} t_m e_{\alpha_m}
\end{aligned}$$

As $\partial\mathcal{M}$ is K-linearly independent, comparison of the coefficients of $b_w e_{\beta_w}$ for all $w \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ yields

$$d_w = \begin{cases} c_{mk} - c_{mj} & \text{if } b_w e_{\beta_w} \in x_s \mathcal{M} \cap x_u \mathcal{M}, \\ c_{mk} & \text{if } b_w e_{\beta_w} \in x_s \mathcal{M} \setminus x_u \mathcal{M}, \\ -c_{mj} & \text{if } b_w e_{\beta_w} \in x_u \mathcal{M} \setminus x_s \mathcal{M}, \\ 0 & \text{if } b_w e_{\beta_w} \notin x_s \mathcal{M} \cup x_u \mathcal{M}. \end{cases}$$

As $\mathcal{M}$ is K-linearly independent, comparison of the coefficients of $t_p e_{\alpha_p}$ for all $p \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= -\sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_u(m)} c_{mj} - \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} d_w c_{pw} \\
&= -\sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_u(m)} c_{mj} \\
&\quad - \sum_{\substack{w \in \{1,\dots,\nu\} \\ b_w e_{\beta_w} \in x_s \mathcal{M}}} c_{mk} c_{pw} + \sum_{\substack{w \in \{1,\dots,\nu\} \\ b_w e_{\beta_w} \in x_u \mathcal{M}}} c_{mj} c_{pw} \\
&= -\sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_u(m)} c_{mj} \\
&\quad - \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{mk} c_{p\varrho_s(m)} + \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{mj} c_{p\varrho_u(m)},
\end{aligned}$$

i. e. the equations (2) of condition D_2) of Theorem 4.13 are satisfied.
Altogether, we see that condition D_2) of Theorem 4.13 is satisfied and thus $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. □

At last, we use all previous characterizations above to prove Buchberger's Criterion for Module Border Bases similar to Buchberger's Criterion for Border Basis [KR05, Prop. 6.4.34]. It allows us to easily determine, whether a given module border prebasis is a module border basis, or not. But before that, we have to define the S-vector of two border vectors in $\mathcal{G}$ in the usual way, cf. [KR05, Page 438].

Definition 4.21. Let $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. Then we call the vector

$$\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) = \tfrac{\mathrm{lcm}(b_i, b_j)}{b_i} \mathcal{G}_i - \tfrac{\mathrm{lcm}(b_i, b_j)}{b_j} \mathcal{G}_j \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \subseteq P^r$$

the **S-vector** of $\mathcal{G}_i$ and $\mathcal{G}_j$.

Theorem 4.22. (Buchberger's Criterion for Module Border Bases) *The $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ if and only if the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.*

- F_1) *We have* $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = 0$ *for all* $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$.
- F_2) *We have* $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = 0$ *for all* $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ *such that the border terms* $b_i e_{\beta_i}, b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ *are neighbors with respect to* $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. We start to show that condition F_1) is satisfied if $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. Let $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. If we have $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) = 0$, we trivially get $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = 0$ by Definition 2.15. Thus suppose that $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) \neq 0$. We apply the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)$ and $\mathcal{G}$ to obtain a representation

$$\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) = \mathcal{V} + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$$

with $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ and $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. Then we have

$$\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = \mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) - \mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K = \{0\}$$

by Corollary 2.19.

Since F_2) is a logical consequence of F_1) by Definition 4.16, it remains to prove that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ if F_2) holds. Let $b_i e_{\beta_i}, b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ be next-door neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$, i. e. $i \neq j$ and

$$x_s b_i e_{\beta_i} = b_j e_{\beta_j}$$

for some $s \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ by Definition 4.16. Let

$$\sigma_{ij} = x_s \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j \in \mathrm{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$$

be the corresponding next-door neighbor syzygy with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. If we have $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) = 0$, we see that σ_{ij} is a lifting of σ_{ij} according to Definition 4.19. Thus suppose that $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) \neq 0$. Since $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = 0$ according to F_2), the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 applied to the S-vector $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)$ and $\mathcal{G}$ yields a representation

$$\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu$$

with polynomials $p_1, \ldots, p_\nu \in P$ such that

$$\deg(p_\ell) \leq \mathrm{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) - 1$$

for all $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ with $p_\ell \neq 0$. We now prove that $(P_1, \ldots, P_\nu) \in P^\nu$ defined by $P_i = x_s - p_i$, $P_j = 1 - p_j$, and $P_\ell = -p_\ell$ for all $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\} \setminus \{i, j\}$ is a lifting of σ_{ij}. By construction, we see that

$$(P_1, \ldots, P_\nu) \in \mathrm{Syz}_P(\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_\nu).$$

Moreover, we have

$$\deg(P_i - x_s) = \deg(-p_i) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) - 1$$

if $P_i - x_s = -p_i \neq 0$,

$$\deg(P_j - 1) = \deg(-p_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) - 1$$

if $P_j - 1 = -p_j \neq 0$, and

$$\deg(P_\ell - 0) = \deg(-p_\ell) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) - 1$$

for all $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\} \setminus \{i, j\}$ with $P_\ell - 0 = -p_\ell \neq 0$. Hence $(P_1, \ldots, P_\nu)$ is a lifting of the next-door neighbor syzygy σ_{ij} with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ by Definition 4.19.
Now suppose that $b_i e_{\beta_i}, b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ are across-the-street neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$, i. e. $i \neq j$ and

$$x_s b_i e_{\beta_i} = x_u b_j e_{\beta_j}$$

for some $s, u \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ by Definition 4.16. Let

$$\sigma_{ij} = x_s \varepsilon_i - x_u \varepsilon_j \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu})$$

be the corresponding across-the-street neighbor syzygy with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. If $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) = 0$, we see that σ_{ij} is a lifting of σ_{ij} according to Definition 4.19. Thus suppose that $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) \neq 0$. Since $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = 0$ according to F_2), the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 applied to the S-vector $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)$ and $\mathcal{G}$ yields a representation

$$\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = p_1 \mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\nu \mathcal{G}_\nu$$

with polynomials $p_1, \ldots, p_\nu \in P$ such that

$$\deg(p_\ell) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) - 1$$

for all $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ with $p_\ell \neq 0$. We now prove that $(P_1, \ldots, P_\nu) \in P^\nu$ defined by $P_i = x_s - p_i$, $P_j = x_u - p_j$, and $P_\ell = -p_\ell$ for all $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\} \setminus \{i, j\}$ is a lifting of σ_{ij}. By construction, we see that

$$(P_1, \ldots, P_\nu) \in \operatorname{Syz}_P(\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_\nu).$$

Moreover, we have

$$\deg(P_i - x_s) = \deg(-p_i) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) - 1$$

if $P_i - x_s = -p_i \neq 0$,

$$\deg(P_j - x_u) = \deg(-p_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) - 1$$

if $P_j - x_u = -p_j \neq 0$, and

$$\deg(P_\ell - 0) = \deg(-p_\ell) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) - 1$$

for all $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\} \setminus \{i, j\}$ with $P_\ell - 0 = -p_\ell \neq 0$. Hence the vector $(P_1, \ldots, P_\nu)$ is a lifting of the across-the-street neighbor syzygy σ_{ij} with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ by Definition 4.19.
Altogether, we have proven that every neighbor syzygy with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ lifts to a syzygy of $(\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_\nu)$. Therefore, condition E_2) of Theorem 4.20 yields that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis. □

Example 4.23. We consider Example 4.17, again. Recall, that the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis was of the form $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_7\} \subseteq P^2$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_1 &= x^2 e_1 - ye_1 + e_2,\\
\mathcal{G}_2 &= xye_1 - e_2,\\
\mathcal{G}_3 &= y^2 e_1 - xe_2,\\
\mathcal{G}_4 &= x^3 e_2 - e_1,\\
\mathcal{G}_5 &= x^2 ye_2 - e_1 - e_2,\\
\mathcal{G}_6 &= xye_2 + 3e_1,\\
\mathcal{G}_7 &= ye_2 - xe_1 - ye_1 - e_1 - e_2,
\end{aligned}$$

and that $b_1 e_{\beta_1} = x^2 e_1$ and $b_2 e_{\beta_2} = xye_1$ are across-the-street neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. We have already seen in Example 4.14 that $\mathcal{G}$ is not the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. Since

$$\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)) = \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(y\mathcal{G}_1 - x\mathcal{G}_2) = xe_1 + ye_1 + e_1 + e_2 \neq 0,$$

condition F_2) of Buchberger's Criterion for Module Border Bases 4.22 also yields that $\mathcal{G}$ is not the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$.

5. The Module Border Basis Algorithm

In this final section of Part 1, we determine the Module Border Basis Algorithm 5.3 that allows us to compute module border bases of arbitrary P-submodules of P^r with finite K-codimension in P^r with linear algebra techniques. The algorithm was originally developed in [KK06, Prop. 18]. Our algorithm is a straightforward adaption of the Border Basis Algorithm as described in [KR05, Thm. 6.4.36].

But first of all, we have to describe what we mean by reducing a vector against a matrix as it was described in [KR05, p. 392].

Definition 5.1. Let $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$.

a) Let $(c_1, \dots, c_s) \in K^s$, $(d_1, \dots, d_s) \in K^s \setminus \{0\}$, and let $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ be minimal such that $d_i \neq 0$. Then the i^{th} component of

$$(c_1, \dots, c_s) - \tfrac{c_i}{d_i}(d_1, \dots, d_s) \in K^s$$

is 0. If $c_i \neq 0$ in this situation, we say that $(d_1, \dots, d_s)$ is a **reduceer** of $(c_1, \dots, c_s)$.

b) Let $v \in K^s$ and $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{r,s}(K)$. We say that v can be **reduced** against $\mathfrak{M}$, if there is a row vector $w \in K^s$ of $\mathfrak{M}$ such that w is a reducer of v.

Before we generalize the Border Basis Algorithm [KR05, Thm. 6.4.36] to the module setting, we have to generalize the auxiliary algorithm [KR05, Lemma 6.4.35].

Algorithm 2 `computeOrderModule`$(d, \{\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho\}, \sigma)$

```
Require: $d \in \mathbb{N}$,
    $\varrho \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\{\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho\} \subseteq \langle \mathbb{T}^n_{\leq d}\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle\rangle_K \setminus \{0\}$,
    $V := \langle \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho \rangle_K \subseteq \langle \mathbb{T}^n_{\leq d}\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle\rangle_K$ is a $K$-vector subspace such that
        $(V + x_1 V + \cdots + x_n V) \cap \langle \mathbb{T}^n_{\leq d}\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle\rangle_K = V$,
    $\sigma$ is a degree compatible term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$
 1: $L := \mathbb{T}^n_{\leq d}\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle$
 2: Let $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_s \in \mathbb{T}^n$ be terms and $u_1, \dots, u_s \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ be indices such that
    $L = \{\ell_1 e_{u_1}, \dots, \ell_s e_{u_s}\}$ and $\ell_1 e_{u_1} >_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}} \ell_2 e_{u_2} >_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}} \cdots >_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}} \ell_s e_{u_s}$.
 3: Determine a $K$-vector space basis $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k\} \subseteq \langle L\rangle_K$ of $V$.
 4: for $i = 1, \dots, k$ do
 5:     Determine $a_{i1}, \dots, a_{is} \in K$ such that $\mathcal{B}_i = a_{i1}\ell_1 e_{u_1} + \cdots + a_{is}\ell_s e_{u_s}$.
 6: end for
 7: $\mathfrak{V} := (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq s} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{k,s}(K)$.
 8: Compute a row echolon form $\mathfrak{W} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{k,s}(K)$ of $\mathfrak{V}$ using row operations.
 9: Let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq L$ be the set of terms in $L$ corresponding to the pivot-free columns
    of $\mathfrak{W}$, i. e. the columns of $\mathfrak{W}$ in which no row of $\mathfrak{W}$ has its first non-zero entry.
10: return $\mathcal{M}$
```

Lemma 5.2. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $L = \mathbb{T}^n_{\leq d}\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle$. Moreover, let $\varrho \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $V = \langle \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho\rangle \subseteq L$ with $\{\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho\} \subseteq \langle L\rangle_K \setminus \{0\}$ be a K-vector subspace such that*

$$(V + x_1 V + \cdots + x_n V) \cap \langle L\rangle_K = V.$$

Let σ be a degree compatible term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$. Then Algorithm 2 is actually an algorithm and the result

$$\mathcal{M} := \texttt{computeOrderModule}(d, \{\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho\}, \sigma)$$

of Algorithm 2 applied to the input data d, $\{\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho\}$, and σ satisfies the following conditions.

i) *The set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq L$ is an order module.*
ii) *The set $\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $\langle L\rangle_K / V$.*
iii) *We have $\#\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M}) = \#\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. Firstly, we show that the procedure is actually an algorithm. Since the operations in line 3, line 5, and line 8 can be computed with linear algebra techniques, and since the procedure is obviously finite, the procedure is an algorithm.

Secondly, we show the correctness of the algorithm. We start with the proof that the set $\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $\langle L\rangle_K / V$ and $\#\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M}) = \#\mathcal{M}$. Let

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\ell_{j_1} e_{u_{j_1}}, \dots, \ell_{j_w} e_{u_{j_w}}\}$$

with $j_1, \dots, j_w \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, and let $c_1, \dots, c_w \in K$ be such that

$$\mathcal{V} = c_1 \ell_{j_1} e_{u_{j_1}} + \cdots + c_w \ell_{j_w} e_{u_{j_w}} \in V.$$

Let $\{\mathfrak{e}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{e}_s\}$ denote the canonical K-vector space basis of K^s. Then the corresponding vector

$$c_1 \mathfrak{e}_{j_1} + \cdots + c_v \mathfrak{e}_{j_w} \in K^s$$

of $\mathcal{V}$ has all its non-zero entries in the columns corresponding to $\mathcal{M}$ by line 9. As $\mathfrak{W}$ is in row echolon form according to line 8, this vector cannot be further reduced against $\mathfrak{W}$ by Definition 5.1. Since the rows of $\mathfrak{V}$ correspond to the K-vector space basis $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k\}$ by the construction in line 5, and since $\mathfrak{W}$ corresponds to these basis elements by line 3 and line 8, and since we also have $\mathcal{V} \in V$, it follows that $\mathcal{V} = 0$. Thus we get $c_1 = \cdots = c_w = 0$, i.e. $\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M})$ is K-linearly independent. In particular, we get $\#\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M}) = \#\mathcal{M}$. Let

$$\mathcal{W} = d_1 \ell_1 e_{u_1} + \cdots + d_s \ell_s e_{u_s} \in \langle L \rangle_K$$

with $d_1, \ldots, d_s \in K$. Then the corresponding vector

$$d_1 \mathfrak{e}_1 + \cdots + d_s \mathfrak{e}_s \in K^s$$

can be reduced against $\mathfrak{W}$ to obtain a vector

$$d'_1 \mathfrak{e}_{j_1} + \cdots + d'_w \mathfrak{e}_{j_w} \in K^s$$

with $d'_1, \ldots, d'_w \in K$ by Definition 5.1. Let

$$\mathcal{W}' = d'_1 \ell_{j_1} e_{u_{j_1}} + \cdots + d'_w \ell_{j_w} e_{u_{j_w}} \in \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$$

be the corresponding element in $\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K$. Then the considerations above show that

$$\mathcal{W} + V = \mathcal{W}' + V$$

and hence $\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M})$ is also a generating set of the K-vector space $\langle L \rangle_K / V$. Altogether, we have proven that $\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $\langle L \rangle_K / V$.
Finally, we prove that $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module. Let $\ell_i e_{u_i} \in L \setminus \mathcal{M}$ with $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ and $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$ be such that $t \ell_i e_{u_i} \in L$. The set $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module by Definition 2.4 if we show that $t \ell_i e_{u_i} \in L \setminus \mathcal{M}$. As $\ell_i e_{u_i} \in L \setminus \mathcal{M}$, one row of $\mathfrak{W}$ has the form

$$(0, \ldots, 0, c_i, \ldots, c_s) \in K^s$$

where $c_i \neq 0$ according to the construction of $\mathcal{M}$ in line 9. The corresponding vector in $\langle L \rangle_K$ is

$$\mathcal{V} = c_i \ell_i e_{u_i} + \cdots + c_s \ell_s e_{u_s} \in \langle L \rangle_K.$$

Moreover, line 2 yields that $\ell_i e_{u_i} = \mathrm{LT}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(\mathcal{V})$. Hence we see that

$$t \ell_i e_{u_i} = \mathrm{LT}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(t\mathcal{V}),$$

and the degree compatibility of σ yields $\mathrm{Supp}(t\mathcal{V}) \subseteq L$. Since every line of the matrix $\mathfrak{V}$ corresponds to a vector in V by line 5, and since $\mathfrak{W}$ is constructed from $\mathfrak{V}$ using row operation by line 8, we see that $\mathcal{V} \in V$. Hence the hypothesis

$$(V + x_1 V + \cdots + x_n V) \cap \langle L \rangle_K = V$$

and induction on the degree of t also yield $t\mathcal{V} \in V$. Thus we see that the vector in K^s corresponding to $t\mathcal{V}$ can be reduced against $\mathfrak{W}$ to zero by Definition 5.1. In particular, we have to reduce the entry of this vector that corresponds to $t \ell_i e_{u_i}$, i.e. there has to be one row in $\mathfrak{W}$ which has its first non-zero entry in the column that corresponds to the term $t \ell_i e_{u_i}$. Altogether, line 9 yields $t \ell_i e_{u_i} \in L \setminus \mathcal{M}$ and the claim follows. □

We now have all ingredients to generalize the Border Bases Algorithm as described in [KR05, Thm. 6.4.36] to the module setting.

Algorithm 3 `moduleBB`$(\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k\}, \sigma)$

```
Require: $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$,
    $\operatorname{codim}_K(\langle \mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k \rangle, P^r) < \infty$,
    $\sigma$ is a degree compatible term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$
 1: if $k = 0$ then
 2:     return $(\emptyset, \emptyset)$
 3: end if
 4: $V := \langle \mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k \rangle_K$
 5: $d := \max\{\deg(t) \mid \ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}, te_u \in \operatorname{Supp}(\mathcal{B}_\ell)\}$
 6: repeat
 7:     $L := \mathbb{T}^n_{\leq d}\langle e_1, \dots, e_r \rangle$
 8:     $V' := (V + x_1 V + \cdots + x_n V) \cap \langle L \rangle_K$
 9:     while $V \neq V'$ do
10:         $V := V'$
11:         $V' := (V + x_1 V + \cdots + x_n V) \cap \langle L \rangle_K$
12:     end while
13:     Compute $\varrho \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho\} \subseteq \langle L \rangle_K \setminus \{0\}$ with $V = \langle \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho \rangle_K$.
14:     $\mathcal{M} :=$ computeOrderIdeal$(d, \{\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho\}, \sigma)$
15:     $d := d + 1$
16: until $\partial\mathcal{M} \subseteq L$
17: Let $t_1, \dots, t_\mu \in \mathbb{T}^n$ be terms and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\mu \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ be indices such that
    $\mathcal{M} = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\}$.
18: Let $b_1, \dots, b_\nu \in \mathbb{T}^n$ be terms and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_\nu \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ be indices such that
    $\partial\mathcal{M} = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}\}$.
19: $\mathcal{G} := \emptyset$
20: for $j = 1, \dots, \nu$ do
21:     Determine $c_{1j}, \dots, c_{\mu j} \in K$ such that $b_j e_{\beta_j} + V = \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} + V$.
22:     $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{G} \cup \{b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i}\}$
23: end for
24: return $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{G})$
```

Theorem 5.3. (The Module Border Basis Algorithm)
Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$*, let* $U = \langle \mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k \rangle \subseteq P^r$ *with vectors* $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$ *be a* P*-submodule such that* $\operatorname{codim}_K(U, P^r) < \infty$*, and let* σ *be a degree compatible term ordering on* $\mathbb{T}^n$*. Then Algorithm 3 is actually an algorithm and the result*

$$(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{G}) := \texttt{moduleBB}(\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k\}, \sigma)$$

of Algorithm 3 applied to the input data $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k\}$ *and* σ *satisfies the following conditions.*

i) *The set* $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r \rangle$ *is an order module.*
ii) *The set* $\mathcal{G} \subseteq P^r$ *is the* $\mathcal{M}$*-module border basis of* U*.*

Proof. Firstly, we prove that every step of the procedure can be computed. The maximum in line 5 can be computed as obviously $k \neq 0$ in this situation. In particular, it follows that $\dim_K(V) \geq 1$ in line 4. We can compute the intersection of K-vector spaces for the computation of V' in line 8 and line 11 with linear algebra techniques. In line 14, the while-loop in line 9 has already been finished. In this situation, the construction of V in line 4 and during the while-loop in line 9 yields $\varrho = \dim_K(V) \geq 1$ and

$$V = V' = (V + x_1 V + \cdots + x_n V) \cap \langle L \rangle_K,$$

after the while-loop. In other words, the input data d, $\{\mathcal{V}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{V}_\varrho\}$, and σ in line 13 satisfy the requirements of Algorithm 2. Thus we can compute an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \langle L \rangle_K$ such that $\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $\langle L \rangle_K / V$ and such that $\#\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M}) = \#\mathcal{M}$ according to Lemma 5.2 in line 14. Moreover, the repeat-until-loop in line 6 only stops if $\partial\mathcal{M} \subseteq L$. Thus we can compute the coefficients $c_{1j}, \ldots, c_{\mu j} \in K$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ in line 21 with linear algebra techniques, too. All the other steps of the procedure can be trivially computed.
Secondly, we show that the procedure stops after a finite amount of time. We start to show that the while-loop in line 9 eventually terminates. By the construction of V and V' in line 10 and line 11, we see that we always have $V \subseteq V' \subseteq \langle L \rangle_K$. Assume that $V \neq V'$ in this situation, i. e. the while-loop in line 9 is executed at least one time. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we let V'_i be the K-vector subspace $V' \subseteq \langle L \rangle_K$ after the i^{th} iteration of the while-loop. Since we have

$$\#L = \#\mathbb{T}^n_{\leq d}\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r \rangle < \infty,$$

i. e. $\dim_K(\langle L \rangle_K) < \infty$, the chain

$$V'_0 \subseteq V'_1 \subseteq V'_2 \subseteq \cdots$$

must eventually get stationary. In this situation, we have $V'_i = V'_{i-1}$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and therefore $V = V'$ in line 9. Thus the while-loop terminates after the i^{th} iteration.
Thirdly, we prove that the repeat-until-loop in line 6 stops after a finite amount of time. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathcal{H}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_v\} \subseteq P^r$ with $v \in \mathbb{N}$ be the reduced σ Pos-Gröbner basis of U. For all $j \in \{1, \ldots, v\}$, there is a representation

$$\mathcal{H}_j = p_{j1}\mathcal{B}_1 + \cdots + p_{jk}\mathcal{B}_k$$

with $p_{j1}, \ldots, p_{jk} \in P$. Let

$$d' = \max\{\deg(t) \mid j \in \{1, \ldots, v\}, l \in \{1, \ldots, k\}, te_u \in \operatorname{Supp}(p_{j\ell}\mathcal{B}_\ell)\}.$$

This maximum exists as $k > 0$ in this situation as we have seen above. Then we have $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \langle L \rangle_K$ after the while-loop in the case that $d = d'$. Now suppose that we are in the situation that $d = d'$ during the repeat-until-loop. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the result of Algorithm 2 computed in line 14. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module such that $\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $\langle L \rangle_K / V$ and $\#\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M}) = \#\mathcal{M}$ by Lemma 5.2. Let

$$L = \{\ell_1 e_{u_1}, \ldots, \ell_s e_{u_s}\}$$

with $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_s \in \mathbb{T}^n$, $u_1, \ldots, u_s \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$, and

$$\ell_1 e_{u_1} >_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}} \cdots >_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}} \ell_s e_{u_s}$$

be like in line 2 of Algorithm 2 during the computation of $\mathcal{M}$ by Algorithm 2 in line 14. Furthermore, we let $\mathfrak{W} \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m,s}(K)$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be the matrix in row echolon form used during the computation of $\mathcal{M}$ by Algorithm 2 in line 14. Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, v\}$. We write

$$\mathcal{H}_j = c_1\ell_1 e_{u_1} + \cdots + c_s\ell_s e_{u_s}$$

with $c_1, \ldots, c_s \in K$. Then the vector

$$(c_1, \ldots, c_s) \in K^s$$

corresponds to $\mathcal{H}_j$. Let

$$\operatorname{LT}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(\mathcal{H}_j) = \ell_w e_{u_w}$$

with $w \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$. Then it follows that

$$(c_1, \ldots, c_s) = (0, \ldots, 0, 1, c_{w+1}, \ldots, c_s).$$

by [KR00, Defn. 2.4.12]. Since $\mathcal{H}_j \in V$, we see that there exists a vector in K^s corresponding to a vector in V which has its first non-zero entry in the w^{th} column of $\mathfrak{W}$, namely the vector

$$(0,\dots,0,1,c_{w+1},\dots,c_s) \in K^s$$

corresponding to $\mathcal{H}_j$. Thus the construction of $\mathcal{M}$ in line 9 of Algorithm 2 yields that

$$\mathrm{LT}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(\mathcal{H}_j) \notin \mathcal{M},$$

and it follows that

$$\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(U).$$

Thus

$$\partial\mathcal{M} \subseteq \overline{\partial\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \overline{\partial\mathcal{O}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(U)} \subseteq L$$

as $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \langle L\rangle_K$ and hence the repeat-until-loop terminates in the case that $d = d'$. Altogether, we see that the procedure is actually an algorithm.

It remains to prove the correctness. We have to distinguish two cases. For the first case, we suppose that the algorithm stops in line 2. Then we see that $\langle \mathcal{B}_1,\dots,\mathcal{B}_k\rangle = \{0\}$ and the assumption $\operatorname{codim}_K(\{0\}, P^r) < \infty$ yields $r = 0$. Thus $\emptyset$ is obviously the $\emptyset$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{B}_1,\dots,\mathcal{B}_k\rangle = \{0\}$ by Definition 2.13. For the second case, we now suppose that $k \neq 0$. As $\mathcal{M}$ is computed in line 14 with the use of Algorithm 2, Lemma 5.2 yields that $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module.
For all $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$, we let

$$\mathcal{G}_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in P^r$$

with $c_{1j},\dots,c_{\mu j} \in K$ be like in line 22. Then $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_\nu\}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis. We now show that $\mathrm{LT}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(\mathcal{G}_j) = b_j e_{\beta_j}$ for all $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$. Let $j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$. Consider $\mathfrak{W} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,s}(K)$ and $\ell_1 e_{u_1},\dots,\ell_s e_{u_s} \in L$ like above, again. We write

$$\mathcal{G}_j = c_1\ell_1 e_{u_1} + \cdots + c_s \ell_s e_{u_s}$$

with $c_1,\dots,c_s \in K$. Then the vector

$$(c_1,\dots,c_s) \in K^s$$

corresponding to $\mathcal{G}_j$ represents a K-linear dependency of the terms in L. Assume that

$$\mathrm{LT}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(\mathcal{H}_j) = \ell_w e_{u_w} \neq b_j e_{\beta_j}$$

with $w \in \{1,\dots,s\}$. As σ is degree compatible, $(c_1,\dots,c_s) \in K^s$ is a vector which has its first non-zero entry in the column corresponding to the term $\ell_w e_{u_w} \in \mathcal{M}$. But this is a contradiction to the construction of $\mathcal{M}$ in line 9 of Algorithm 2, i. e. we have

$$\mathrm{LT}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(\mathcal{G}_j) = b_j e_{\beta_j}.$$

We go on with the proof that the normal remainders of the S-vectors of all neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ vanish. Let $b_i e_{\beta_i}, b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ with $i,j \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$ and $i \neq j$ be neighbors with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. We have already shown that we have $\partial\mathcal{M} \subseteq L$ at the end of the algorithm, i. e. we have $\overline{\partial\mathcal{M}} \subseteq L$. Using the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 applied to $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i,\mathcal{G}_j)$ and $\mathcal{G}$, we can compute $c_1,\dots,c_\nu \in K$ such that

$$\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i,\mathcal{G}_j)) = \mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i,\mathcal{G}_j) - \sum_{w=1}^{\nu} c_w \mathcal{G}_w \in \langle \mathcal{M}\rangle_K.$$

Since we have also already seen that $\mathcal{G} \subseteq V$, i. e. we have $\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) \in V$ as $b_i e_{\beta_i}, b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ are neighbors, and $\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $\langle L\rangle_K/V$, it follows that

$$V = \mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j) + V = \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) + V.$$

In particular, we see that

$$\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) \in V \cap \langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K = \{0\}.$$

Altogether, we see that condition F_2) of Buchberger's Criterion for Module Border Bases 4.22 is satisfied, i. e. $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$.
Therefore, the claim follows if we show that $\mathcal{G}$ generates U. For every $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$, we have already seen that $\mathcal{G}_j \in V \subseteq U$, i. e. we have $\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle \subseteq U$. For the converse inclusion, we let $w \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. We apply the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathcal{B}_w$ and $\mathcal{G}$ to obtain a representation

$$\mathcal{B}_w = \mathcal{V} + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{B}_w)$$

with $\mathcal{V} \in \langle\mathcal{G}\rangle$ and $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{B}_w) \in \langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K$. During the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14, we always subtract multiples of the form $t\mathcal{G}_j$ with a term $t \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ to eliminate the term $tb_j e_{\beta_j}$. Since σ is a degree compatible term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$ and since we have $b_j e_{\beta_j} = \mathrm{LT}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(\mathcal{G}_j)$, it follows that all the vectors that are used for these reductions satisfy $t\mathcal{G}_j \in \langle L\rangle_K$. Thus we have

$$\mathcal{V} \in V \subseteq \langle L\rangle_K$$

because $\mathcal{G} \subseteq V$. Altogether, we see that

$$V = \mathcal{B}_w + V = \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{B}_w) + V.$$

Since $\varepsilon_V(\mathcal{M})$ is a K-vector space basis of $\langle L\rangle_K/V$ by Lemma 5.2, it follows that

$$\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{B}_w) \in V \cap \langle\mathcal{M}\rangle_K = \{0\}.$$

Thus it also follows that

$$\mathcal{B}_w = \mathcal{V} + \mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{B}_w) = \mathcal{V} \in \langle\mathcal{G}\rangle,$$

Therefore, we see that

$$U = \langle\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k\rangle \subseteq \langle\mathcal{G}\rangle.$$

Altogether, we have proven that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-border basis of U. □

Example 5.4. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}$, $P = \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$, and $\sigma =$ `DegRevLex`. Furthermore, we let

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \langle\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_5\rangle \\ &= \langle(-2, 3x-1), (3x+4, 2), (0, y-1), (y-1, 0), (x+y+1, -x+y)\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have $xe_2, xe_1, ye_2, ye_1 \in \mathrm{LT}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(U)$, we immediately see that

$$\mathrm{codim}_K(U, P^2) = \#\mathcal{O}_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}}(U) \leq \#\{e_1, e_2\} = 2 < \infty$$

with Macaulay's Basis Theorem [KR00, Thm. 1.5.7]. Thus the requirements of the Module Basis Algorithm 3 are satisfied.

We consider the steps of the Module Border Basis Algorithm 3 applied to the input data $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_5\}$ and σ in detail. We initialize

$$V = \langle(-2, 3x-1), (3x+4, 2), (0, y-1), (y-1, 0), (x+y+1, -x+y)\rangle_K$$

in line 4 and thus have $d = 1$ and

$$L = \mathbb{T}^2_{\leq 1}\langle e_1, e_2\rangle = \{xe_1 xe_2, ye_1, ye_2, e_1 e_2\}$$

in line 5. Moreover, we compute that

$$V' = (V + xV + yV) \cap \langle L \rangle_K = V$$

in line 8. Thus the while-loop in line 9 does not need to be executed and we have $\{\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_5\} = \{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_5\}$ in line 13.

Next we consider the computation of $\mathcal{M}$ in line 14 with Algorithm 2 applied to the input data 1, $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_5\}$, and σ. We order the terms in L according to $\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}$ descendingly and compute the matrix

$$\mathfrak{V} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & -2 & -1 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{5,6}(\mathbb{Q})$$

like in line 7 of Algorithm 2. The (reduced) row echolon form needed in line 8 of Algorithm 2 is then

$$\mathfrak{W} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{4}{3} & \frac{2}{3} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{2}{3} & -\frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{5,6}(\mathbb{Q}),$$

i. e. we get the order module

$$\mathcal{M} = \{e_1, e_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$$

after line 14 of Algorithm 3.

As the border of $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies

$$\partial\mathcal{M} = \{xe_1, xe_2, ye_1, ye_2\} \subseteq L,$$

we stop the computation of the repeat-until-loop in line 6. We then proceed with the computation of the for-loop in line 20 and get the set $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_4\} \subseteq P^2$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_1 &= xe_1 + \tfrac{4}{3}e_1 + \tfrac{2}{3}e_2, \\ \mathcal{G}_2 &= xe_2 - \tfrac{2}{3}e_1 - \tfrac{1}{3}e_2, \\ \mathcal{G}_3 &= ye_1 - e_1, \\ \mathcal{G}_4 &= ye_2 - e_2. \end{aligned}$$

According to Theorem 5.3, $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module and $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U. In particular, since the set of all corners of $\mathcal{M}$ is $\{xe_1, xe_2, ye_1, ye_2\}$ by Definition 3.2, $\mathcal{G}$ is also the reduced σ-Gröbner basis of U according to Proposition 3.3.

Remark 5.5. In contrast to the theory of border bases in [KR05, Section 6.4] or [KK05], we explicitly had allowed that order ideals in $\mathbb{T}^n$ are empty by Definition 2.1. The reason is as follows: Let σ be a degree compatible term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$, and let $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$ be vectors such that $U = \langle \mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k \rangle \subseteq P^r$ is a P-submodule with $\mathrm{codim}_K(U, P^r) < \infty$. Moreover, assume that $r \geq 2$ and $e_1 - e_2 \in U$, i. e. U contains a K-linear dependency of the elements $\{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$. Then the result $\mathcal{M}$ in line 14 of the Module Border Bases Algorithm 5.3 applied to $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k\}$ and σ does not contain all the elements of $\{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$, namely the above K-linear dependency yields $e_1 \notin \mathcal{M}$ as $e_1 >_{\sigma\,\mathrm{Pos}} e_2$. By allowing empty order ideals in Definition 2.1, this fact does not vanish, but the result of the algorithm is still an order module according to Definition 2.4.

Part 2. Module Border Bases of Quotient Modules

In Part 1, we have defined module border basis of P-submodules $U \subseteq P^r$ with finite K-codimension and $r \in \mathbb{N}$. In Part 2, we extend this theory to module border bases of P-submodules $U^S \subseteq P^r/S$ of quotient modules of P^r modulo an arbitrary given P-submodule $S \subseteq P^r$ with finite K-codimension and $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

In Section 6, we introduce the general concept of quotient module border bases. We start to generalize order modules to order quotient modules in Definition 6.1. In Definition 6.3, we introduce quotient module border bases as a straightforward generalization of module border bases. Given a quotient module border basis, we then construct characterizing module border prebases in Definition 6.7. The central result of this section, Theorem 6.10, then allows us to characterize quotient module border bases with the use of these characterizing module border prebases. As a consequence of this, we will determine an algorithm for the computation of quotient module border bases in Corollary 6.14. Moreover, we deduce characterizations of quotient module border bases similar to the characterizations of module border bases in Section 4. In particular, we characterize quotient module border bases via the special generation property in Corollary 6.16, via border form modules in Corollary 6.17, via rewrite rules in Corollary 6.18, via commuting matrices in Corollary 6.19, via liftings of border syzygies in Corollary 6.20, and via Buchberger's Criterion for Quotient Module Border Bases in Corollary 6.21.

In Section 7, we apply the notion of quotient module border bases to subideal border bases, which have been introduced in [KP11]. To this end, we then see in Proposition 7.3 that every subideal border basis is isomorphic as P-module to a quotient module border basis. We will use this isomorphy to deduce an algorithm for the computation of subideal border bases in Corollary 7.3 and to characterize subideal border bases in Remark 7.7.

6. Quotient Module Border Bases

In this section, we define module border bases of arbitrary quotient modules of free P-modules of finite rank over the polynomial ring P. To this end, we always let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S \subseteq P^r$ be a P-submodule. Moreover, we let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_r\}$ be the canonical P-module basis of the free P-module P^r. Recall, for every P-module M (respectively K-vector space) and for every P-submodule $U \subseteq M$ (respectively K-vector subspace), we let

$$\varepsilon_U : M \twoheadrightarrow M/U, \quad m \mapsto m + U$$

be the canonical P-module epimorphism (K-vector space epimorphism).

We start with the generalization of order modules defined in Definition 2.4 and their border in Definition 2.5.

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_1 e_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_r e_r$ with order ideals $\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be an order module.

a) We call the set

$$\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{O}_1 \cdot (e_1 + S) \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_r \cdot (e_r + S) \subseteq P^r/S$$

an **order quotient module**.

b) The set

$$\partial\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M}) = \varepsilon_S(\partial\mathcal{M}) = \partial\mathcal{O}_1 \cdot (e_1 + S) \cup \cdots \cup \partial\mathcal{O}_r \cdot (e_r + S) \subseteq P^r/S$$

is called the **(first) border** of $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$.

Example 6.2. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}$, $P = \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$, let $\{e_1, e_2\}$ be the canonical P-module basis of P^2, and let

$$S = \langle xe_1 - ye_2 \rangle \subseteq P^2.$$

Additionally, we let $\mathcal{O}_1 = \{x, y, 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2$ and $\mathcal{O}_2 = \{x, 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$. Then both $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ are order ideals by Definition 2.1 and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}^S &= \mathcal{O}_1 \cdot (e_1 + S) \cup \mathcal{O}_2 \cdot (e_2 + S)\\ &= \{xe_1 + S, ye_1 + S, e_1 + S, xe_2 + S, e_2 + S\}\end{aligned}$$

is an order quotient module with border

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\mathcal{M}^S &= \partial\mathcal{O}_1 \cdot (e_1 + S) \cup \partial\mathcal{O}_2 \cdot (e_2 + S)\\ &= \{x^2, xy, y^2\} \cdot (e_1 + S) \cup \{x^2, xy, y\} \cdot (e_2 + S)\\ &= \{xye_1 + S, y^2e_1 + S, x^2e_2 + S, xye_2 + S, ye_2 + S\}\end{aligned}$$

according to Definition 6.1 as $x^2e_1 + S = xye_2 + S$. In particular, we also see that

$$xe_1 + S = ye_2 + S \in \mathcal{M}^S \cap \partial\mathcal{M}^S.$$

Similar to the definition of order modules in Definition 2.4, we now define quotient module border prebases to be the images of module border prebases under the canonical P-module epimosphism ε_S.

Definition 6.3. Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_1e_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_re_r$ be an order module with finite order ideals $\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$. We write $\mathcal{M} = \{t_1e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\}$ and the border $\partial\mathcal{M} = \{b_1e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}\}$ with $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. Moreover, we let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_\nu\} \subseteq P^r$ be an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis with $\mathcal{G}_j = b_je_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij}t_ie_{\alpha_i}$ where $c_{1j}, \ldots, c_{\mu j} \in K$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$.

a) We call the set $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}) = \{\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_1), \ldots, \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_\nu)\} \subseteq P^r/S$ where

$$\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_j) = \mathcal{G}_j + S = b_je_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij}t_ie_{\alpha_i} + S$$

an $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$**-quotient module border prebasis**.

b) Let $U^S \subseteq P^r/S$ be a P-submodule. The $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$-quotient module border prebasis $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq P^r/S$ is called an $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$**-quotient module border basis** of U^S if $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq U^S$, if the set

$$(\varepsilon_{U^S} \circ \varepsilon_S)(\mathcal{M}) = \{(t_1e_{\alpha_1} + S) + U^S, \ldots, (t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + S) + U^S\}$$

is a K-vector space basis of $(P^r/S)/U^S$, and if $\#(\varepsilon_{U^S} \circ \varepsilon_S)(\mathcal{M}) = \mu$.

Remark 6.4. One might think that all the definitions and propositions about module border bases in Part 1 can be generalized to quotient module border bases in a straightforward way. Unfortunately, the situation is more complicated than expected. We have already seen one big difference concerning module border bases and quotient module border bases in Example 6.2. Namely, we have seen that it can happen that the order quotient module and its border have some elements in common, i. e. the straightforward, analogous version of Proposition 2.7 is wrong. Since most of the propositions in Part 1 are based on this proposition, the theory of quotient module border bases needs much more care in the definitions and proofs. Moreover, we see that quotient module border bases are indeed a real extension of module border bases—meaning that the theory cannot be copied from the usual module border bases in a straightforward way—and thus also of the usual border bases.

As we have seen in Remark 6.4, we cannot proof analogous versions of every proposition in Part 1. Fortunately, we can reuse some of the concepts, e. g. we can prove the uniqueness of quotient border bases—if there exists one—similar to the proof in Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 6.5. (Uniqueness of Quotient Module Border Bases) *Let $\mathcal{M}^S \subseteq P^r/S$ be a finite order quotient module, $U^S \subseteq P^r/S$ be a P-submodule, and let $\mathcal{G}^S, \mathcal{G}'^S \subseteq P^r/S$ be two $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border bases of U^S. Then we have $\mathcal{G}^S = \mathcal{G}'^S$.*

Proof. We write the order quotient module $\mathcal{M}^S = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + S, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + S\}$ and its border $\partial\mathcal{M}^S = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1} + S, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu} + S\}$ with $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, terms $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Then the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border bases $\mathcal{G}^S$ and $\mathcal{G}'^S$ are of the form $\mathcal{G}^S = \{\mathcal{G}^S_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}^S_\nu\} \subseteq P^r/S$ with $\mathcal{G}^S_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} + S$ where $c_{1j}, \dots, c_{\mu j} \in K$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$, and of the form $\mathcal{G}'^S = \{\mathcal{G}'^S_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}'^S_\nu\} \subseteq P^r/S$ with $\mathcal{G}'^S_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c'_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} + S$ where $c'_{1j}, \dots, c'_{\mu j} \in K$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ by Definition 6.3. Assume that $c_{ij} \neq c'_{ij}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Then we have the non-trivial K-linear dependency

$$\begin{aligned} U^S &= \mathcal{G}^S_j - \mathcal{G}'^S_j + U^S \\ &= \left(b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{k=1}^{\mu} c_{kj} t_k e_{\alpha_k} - b_j e_{\beta_j} + \sum_{k=1}^{\mu} c'_{kj} t_k e_{\alpha_k} + S \right) + U^S \\ &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\mu} (-c_{kj} + c'_{kj}) t_k e_{\alpha_k} + S \right) + U^S \end{aligned}$$

in contradiction to Definition 6.3 and the claim follows. □

For the remainder of this section, we let

$$\mathcal{M}^S = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + S, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + S\} \subseteq P^r/S$$

be a finite order quotient module with border

$$\partial\mathcal{M}^S = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1} + S, \dots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu} + S\} \subseteq P^r/S$$

where $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Moreover, we let $\mathcal{G}^S = \{\mathcal{G}^S_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}^S_\nu\} \subseteq P^r/S$ with

$$\mathcal{G}^S_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} + S,$$

where $c_{ij} \in K$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$, be an $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border prebasis .

We have already seen in Definition 6.3 that quotient module border bases are very similar to module border bases, cf. Definition 2.13. We now want to study their similarity in more detail. In order to do this, we regard special order modules that correspond to $\mathcal{M}^S$ in Definition 6.6 and construct special module border prebasis $\mathcal{G} \subseteq P^r$ that correspond to $\mathcal{G}^S$ in Definition 6.7. If there exists such a corresponding module border prebasis $\mathcal{G} \subseteq P^r$, we can reduce the question whether $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border bases of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S \rangle$, or not, in Theorem 6.10 to the question whether $\mathcal{G}$ is the module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ and $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. This result is the core of the theory of quotient module border bases as it implicitly allows us to reuse many results of Part 1. In particular, we use this theorem to compute and characterize quotient module border bases at the end of this section.

Definition 6.6. We call an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$ an **order module characterizing** $\mathcal{M}^S$ if $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}^S$ and if the restriction $\varepsilon_S|_\mathcal{M}$ of ε_S to $\mathcal{M}$ is injective.

Definition 6.7. Let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$ be an order module characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$. By choosing suitable representatives of the elements in $\mathcal{M}^S \subseteq P^r/S$, we can w. l. o. g. assume that

$$\mathcal{M} = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$$

as $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}^S$ and as $\varepsilon_S|_\mathcal{M}$ is injective by Definition 6.6. The border of $\mathcal{M}$ then has the form

$$\partial\mathcal{M} = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu e_{\beta_\nu}, b_{\nu+1} e_{\beta_{\nu+1}}, \ldots, b_\omega e_{\beta_\omega}\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$$

with an $\omega \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega \geq \nu$, $b_{\nu+1}, \ldots, b_\omega \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and $\beta_{\nu+1}, \ldots, \beta_\omega \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. For all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$, we define

$$\mathcal{G}_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in P^r.$$

For all $j \in \{\nu + 1, \ldots, \omega\}$, there exists a unique index $k \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ such that

$$b_j e_{\beta_j} + S = \varepsilon_S(b_j e_{\beta_j}) = \varepsilon_S(b_k e_{\beta_k}) = b_k e_{\beta_k} + S$$

according to Definition 6.1 and we define

$$\mathcal{G}_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} c_{ik} t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in P^r.$$

We call the set $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_\omega\} \subseteq P^r$ the **$\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S$**.

Example 6.8. We consider Example 6.2, again. Recall, that

$$S = \langle xe_1 - ye_2\rangle \subseteq P^2,$$

that the order quotient module has the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}^S &= \{x, y, 1\} \cdot (e_1 + S) \cup \{x, 1\} \cdot (e_2 + S)\\ &= \{xe_1 + S, ye_1 + S, e_1 + S, xe_2 + S, e_2 + S\},\end{aligned}$$

and that its border is

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\mathcal{M}^S &= \{x^2, xy, y^2\} \cdot (e_1 + S) \cup \{x^2, xy, y\} \cdot (e_2 + S)\\ &= \{xye_1 + S, y^2 e_1 + S, x^2 e_2 + S, xye_2 + S, ye_2 + S\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then the set $\mathcal{G}^S = \{\mathcal{G}_1^S, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_5^S\} \subseteq P^2/S$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1^S &= xye_1 - ye_1 + S\\ \mathcal{G}_2^S &= y^2 e_1 - e_1 - e_2 + S\\ \mathcal{G}_3^S &= x^2 e_2 + e_1 + S\\ \mathcal{G}_4^S &= xye_2 - xe_1 + e_2 + S\\ \mathcal{G}_5^S &= ye_2 - e_2 + S\end{aligned}$$

is an $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border prebasis according to Definition 6.3.
Moreover, we immediately see that the set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M} &= \{x, y, 1\} \cdot e_1 \cup \{x, 1\} \cdot e_2\\ &= \{xe_1, ye_1, e_1, xe_2, e_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, e_2\rangle\end{aligned}$$

is an order module characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ by Definition 6.6. The border of $\mathcal{M}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\mathcal{M} &= \{x^2, xy, y^2\} \cdot e_1 \cup \{x^2, xy, y\} \cdot e_2 \\ &= \{xye_1, y^2e_1, x^2e_2, xye_2, ye_2, x^2e_1\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2\langle e_1, e_2\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the set $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_6\} \subseteq P^2$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1 &= xye_1 - ye_1 \\ \mathcal{G}_2 &= y^2e_1 - e_1 - e_2 \\ \mathcal{G}_3 &= x^2e_2 + e_1 \\ \mathcal{G}_4 &= xye_2 - xe_1 + e_2 \\ \mathcal{G}_5 &= ye_2 - e_2 \\ \mathcal{G}_6 &= x^2e_1 - xe_1 + e_2\end{aligned}$$

is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S$ according to Definition 6.7 as

$$x^2e_1 + S = xye_2 + S.$$

Note that

$$\#\mathcal{G}^S = 5 < 6 = \#\mathcal{G}$$

and that the construction yields

$$\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_6) = x^2e_1 - xe_1 + e_2 + S = xye_2 - xe_1 + e_2 + S = \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_4) = \mathcal{G}_4^S.$$

After the following auxiliary lemma, we are ready to prove our main result, namely the characterization of quotient module border bases via characterizing module border bases.

Lemma 6.9. *Let $\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k \in P^r$ and let $\mathcal{B}_\ell^S = \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{B}_\ell) = \mathcal{B}_\ell + S \subseteq P^r/S$ be for every index $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Furthermore, we let $U = \langle \mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k\rangle \subseteq P^r$ and $U^S = \langle \mathcal{B}_1^S, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k^S\rangle \subseteq P^r/S$.*
In addition, suppose there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r\rangle$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ and let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq P^r$ be the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S$.

a) *We have $\varepsilon_S(U) = U^S$. In particular, $\varepsilon_S(\langle\mathcal{G}\rangle) = \langle\mathcal{G}^S\rangle$.*
b) *We have $\varepsilon_S^{-1}(U^S) = U + S$. In particular, $\varepsilon_S^{-1}(\langle\mathcal{G}^S\rangle) = \langle\mathcal{G}\rangle + S$.*
c) *The set $\mathcal{G}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis.*

Proof. The definitions of U and U^S immediately yield the first claim of a). Thus we go on with the proof of the first claim of b). For the first inclusion, we let

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{B}_1 + \cdots + p_k\mathcal{B}_k + \mathcal{S} \in U + S$$

with polynomials $p_1, \ldots, p_k \in P$ and $\mathcal{S} \in S$. Then we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{V}) &= p_1\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{B}_1) + \cdots + p_k\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{B}_k) + \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{S}) \\ &= p_1\mathcal{B}_1^S + \cdots + p_k\mathcal{B}_k^S \in U^S.\end{aligned}$$

For the converse inclusion, we let $\mathcal{W} \in \varepsilon_S^{-1}(U^S) \subseteq P^r$. Then there exist polynomials $q_1, \ldots, q_k \in P$ such that

$$\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{W}) = q_1\mathcal{B}_1^S + \cdots + q_k\mathcal{B}_k^S = \varepsilon_S(q_1\mathcal{B}_1 + \cdots + q_k\mathcal{B}_k).$$

Thus we have

$$\mathcal{W} - (q_1\mathcal{B}_1 + \cdots + q_k\mathcal{B}_k) \in \ker(\varepsilon_S) = S$$

and this yields $\mathcal{W} \in U + S$.

Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_\omega\} \subseteq P^r$ with $\omega \geq \nu$ be written like in Definition 6.7. Then the second claims of a) and b) follow by the construction of $\mathcal{G}$ according to Definition 6.7

and the above proofs as for all $j \in \{\nu+1,\dots,\omega\}$, there exists a $k \in \{1,\dots,\nu\}$ such that $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_j) = \mathcal{G}_k^S$.

Finally, the construction of $\mathcal{M}$ in Definition 6.6 and $\mathcal{G}$ in Definition 6.7 yield that $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module and that $\mathcal{G}$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis. □

We now use Lemma 6.9 to proof the main result of this section, namely the characterization of quotient module border bases via characterizing module border bases.

Theorem 6.10. (Characterization of Quotient Module Border Bases) *Suppose that there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ and let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq P^r$ be the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S \subseteq P^r/S$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

i) *The $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle$.*
ii) *The $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$ and we have $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\dots,e_r\rangle$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1,\dots,\mathcal{G}_\omega\} \subseteq P^r$ with $\omega \geq \nu$ be written like in Definition 6.7. In particular, i. e. $\mathcal{M} = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1},\dots,t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\}$.

Firstly, we prove that $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$ if $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle$. Suppose that $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle$. Assume that $S \nsubseteq \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$. Let $\mathcal{S} \in S\backslash\langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$. We apply the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ to obtain a representation

$$\mathcal{S} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\omega\mathcal{G}_\omega + c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}$$

with $p_1,\dots,p_\omega \in P$ and $c_1,\dots,c_\mu \in K$. Since $\mathcal{S} \notin \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$, we see that

$$c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} \neq 0$$

and thus there exists an index $i \in \{1,\dots,\mu\}$ such that $c_i \neq 0$. Moreover, Lemma 6.9 yields

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{S}) + \langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle\\ &= \varepsilon_S(p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\omega\mathcal{G}_\omega + c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) + \langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle\\ &= (p_1\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_1) + \cdots + p_\omega\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_\omega) + (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) + S) + \langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle\\ &= (c_1 t_1 e_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + S) + \langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}^S$ and $\varepsilon_S|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is injective according to Definition 6.6 and as $c_i \neq 0$, it follows that $\varepsilon_{\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle}(\mathcal{M}^S) \subseteq (P^r/S)/\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle$ is K-linearly dependent in contradiction to Definition 6.3. Altogether, we have proven that $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$.

Secondly, we prove the claimed equivalence. Suppose that $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$. Then Lemma 6.9 yields $\varepsilon_S^{-1}(\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle) = \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$ and hence ε_S induces a P-module isomorphism

$$P^r/\langle \mathcal{G}\rangle = P^r/\varepsilon_S^{-1}(\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle) \cong \varepsilon_S(P^r)/\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle = (P^r/S)/\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle$$

according to the Second Noether Isomorphism Theorem. As $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}^S$ and as $\varepsilon_S|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is injective by Definition 6.6, it follows that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$ if and only if $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle$ by Definition 2.13 and Definition 6.3. □

Example 6.11. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $P = \mathbb{Q}[x,y]$. Furthermore, we let

$$S = \langle (x+y+1, -x+y)\rangle \subseteq P^2$$

be a P-submodule,

$$\varepsilon_S : P^2 \twoheadrightarrow P^2/S, \quad \mathcal{V} \mapsto \mathcal{V} + S,$$

be the canonical P-module epimorphism, and $\{e_1, e_2\}$ be the canonical P-module basis of P^2. Consider the order module

$$\mathcal{M} = \{e_1, e_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2\langle e_1, e_2\rangle,$$

and the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_4\} \subseteq P^2$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_1 &= xe_1 + \tfrac{4}{3}e_1 + \tfrac{2}{3}e_2,\\
\mathcal{G}_2 &= xe_2 - \tfrac{2}{3}e_1 - \tfrac{1}{3}e_2,\\
\mathcal{G}_3 &= ye_1 - e_1,\\
\mathcal{G}_4 &= ye_2 - e_2.
\end{aligned}$$

In Example 5.4, we have shown that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of

$$U = \langle (x+y+1, -x+y), (-2, 3x-1), (3x+4, 2), (0, y-1), (y-1, 0)\rangle \subseteq P^2.$$

In particular, we hence have $U = \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$ by Corollary 2.17. Let

$$\mathcal{M}^S = \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M}) = \{e_1 + S, e_2 + S\}$$

and $\mathcal{G}^S = \{\mathcal{G}_1^S, \ldots, \mathcal{G}_4^S\} = \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq P^2/S$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_1^S &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_1) = xe_1 + \tfrac{4}{3}e_1 + \tfrac{2}{3}e_2 + S,\\
\mathcal{G}_2^S &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_2) = xe_2 - \tfrac{2}{3}e_1 - \tfrac{1}{3}e_2 + S,\\
\mathcal{G}_3^S &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_3) = ye_1 - e_1 + S,\\
\mathcal{G}_4^S &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_4) = ye_2 - e_2 + S.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we see that $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module characterizing the order quotient module $\mathcal{M}^S$ by Definition 6.6 and $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing the $\mathcal{M}$-quotient module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}^S$ by Definition 6.7. As we also have

$$S = \langle (x+y+1, -x+y)\rangle \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle,$$

and as $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$, Theorem 6.10 yields that $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle &= \langle \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G})\rangle\\
&= \langle (-2, 3x-1) + S, (3x+4, 2) + S, (0, y-1) + S, (y-1, 0) + S\rangle \subseteq P^2/S.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.12. The assumption in Theorem 6.10 that an order module $\mathcal{M}$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ exists, is crucial as the following example shows.

Let $P = \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$, $\{e_1, e_2\}$ be the canonical P-module basis of P^2, and

$$S = \langle xe_1 - ye_2\rangle \subseteq P^2.$$

We consider the order quotient module

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}^S &= \{x^2, x, 1\} \cdot (e_1 + S) \cup \{y^2, y, 1\} \cdot (e_2 + S)\\
&= \{x^2e_1 + S, xe_1 + S, e_1 + S, y^2e_2 + S, ye_2 + S, e_2 + S\}\\
&= \{e_1 + S, y^2e_2 + S, ye_2 + S, e_2 + S, xye_2 + S\}\\
&= \{1\} \cdot (e_1 + S) \cup \{xy, y^2, y, 1\} \cdot (e_2 + S) \subseteq P^2/S.
\end{aligned}$$

We see that $\#\mathcal{M}^S = 5$ as

$$xe_1 + S = ye_2 + S \in \mathcal{M}^S,$$

and that

$$x^2e_1 + S = xye_2 + S \in \mathcal{M}^S.$$

Assume that there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2\langle e_1, e_2\rangle$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$. Then we have $\#\mathcal{M}^S = 5$, $y^2e_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, and $x^2e_1 \in \mathcal{M}$ or $xye_2 \in \mathcal{M}$. If $x^2e_1 \in \mathcal{M}$, Definition 6.6 and Definition 2.4 yield the contradiction

$$\#\mathcal{M} \geq \#(\{x^2, x, 1\} \cdot e_1 \cup \{y^2, y, 1\} \cdot e_2) = 6 > 5 = \#\mathcal{M}^S.$$

If $xye_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, Definition 2.4 yields that $xe_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ and hence we get the contradiction $\varepsilon_S(xe_2) = xe_2 + S \in \mathcal{M}^S$ by Definition 6.6.
Thus there exists no order module characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ by Definition 6.6. In particular, we see that we cannot use Theorem 6.10 for every $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis.

Remark 6.13. Although we have seen in Remark 6.4 that we cannot reuse the the results of module border bases in Part 1 in a straightforward way, we can identify quotient module border bases with their characterizing module border bases—if they exist—according to Theorem 6.10. This allows us to define similar concept like the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14—and thus the normal remainder—for quotient module border bases the following way.

Suppose that there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r\rangle$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$. Firstly, we have to compute an order module $\mathcal{M}$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ like in Definition 6.6 and the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}$ characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S$ like in Definition 6.7. Secondly, we have to determine one representative $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$ of a given element $\mathcal{V}^S \in P^r/S$ and apply the Module Border Division Algorithm 2.14 to $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ to obtain a representation

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \dots + p_\omega\mathcal{G}_\omega + c_1t_1e_{\alpha_1} + \dots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}$$

with $p_1, \dots, p_\omega \in P$ and $c_1, \dots, c_\mu \in K$. Finally, we have to apply ε_S to this result and get a similar representation of $\mathcal{V}^S \in P^r/S$, namely

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}^S &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{V})\\ &= p_1\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_1) + \dots + p_\omega\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_\omega) + (c_1t_1e_{\alpha_1} + \dots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) + S\\ &= q_1\mathcal{G}_1^S + \dots + q_\nu\mathcal{G}_\nu^S + (c_1t_1e_{\alpha_1} + \dots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}) + S \in P^r/S\end{aligned}$$

with polynomials $q_1, \dots, q_\nu \in P$, cf. Lemma 6.9 and Definition 6.7. We can then define the element

$$c_1t_1e_{\alpha_1} + \dots + c_\mu t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu} + S \in P^r/S,$$

which is a representative of the residue class $\mathcal{V}^S + \langle\mathcal{G}^S\rangle \in (P^r/S)/\langle\mathcal{G}^S\rangle$, to be the normal remainder of $\mathcal{V}^S \in P^r/S$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}^S$ and $\mathcal{V}$. In particular, we are then able to generalize Corollary 2.17 and Corollary 2.18 to quotient module border bases using this construction.

Many other concepts can be defined for quotient module border bases the same way, e. g. an $\mathcal{M}^S$-index like in Definition 2.10 or the special generation property in Theorem 4.1. But note that the result of the last step, namely applying ε_S to the result in P^r, can lead to inconsistencies if we do not distinguish between different representatives of the given residue class, as the following example shows.
We consider Example 6.8, again. Recall, that we have had

$$xe_1 + S = ye_2 + S \in \mathcal{M}^S \cap \partial\mathcal{M}^S.$$

Then the above construction assigns $xe_1 + S$ the $\mathcal{M}^S$-index $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(xe_1) = 0$, whereas the same residue class $ye_2 + S$ is also assigned the $\mathcal{M}^S$-index $\operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(ye_2) = 1$.

Altogether, we see that we can reuse the concepts of Part 1 but we sometimes must not define these concepts for a given residue class in P^r/S itself, but only for a specific representative of it in P^r.

We now use Theorem 6.10 to determine an algorithm that computes a quotient module border basis of an arbitrary P-submodule $U^S \subseteq P^r/S$ with finite K-codimension in P^r/S. The idea of this algorithm is, that we first compute an $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis $\mathcal{G} \subseteq P^r$ of the P-submodule $\varepsilon_S^{-1}(U^S) \subseteq P^r$ and then apply ε_S to the result to derive the $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$-quotient module border prebasis $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G})$, again. Then we see that $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module characterizing $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$ and that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$-module border prebasis characterizing $\varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G})$, and hence the claim follows with Theorem 6.10.

```
Algorithm 4 quotModuleBB($\{\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k\}, \{\mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell\}, \sigma$)
Require: $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$,
    $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{\mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$,
    $\operatorname{codim}_K(\langle \mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k \rangle + \langle \mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell \rangle, P^r) < \infty$,
    $\sigma$ is a degree compatible term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$
1: $S := \langle \mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell \rangle$
2: Let $\varepsilon_S : P^r \twoheadrightarrow P^r/S,\ e_k \mapsto e_k + S$.
3: $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{G}) :=$ moduleBB($\{\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k, \mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell\}, \sigma$)
4: $\mathcal{M}^S := \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$
5: $\mathcal{G}^S := \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G})$
6: return $(\mathcal{M}^S, \mathcal{G}^S)$
```

Corollary 6.14. (The Quotient Module Border Basis Algorithm) *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S = \langle \mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell \rangle \subseteq P^r$ with $\{\mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$ be a P-submodule. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $U^S = \langle \mathcal{B}_1 + S, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k + S \rangle \subseteq P^r/S$ with $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$ be a P-submodule such that $\operatorname{codim}_K(U^S, P^r/S) < \infty$. Moreover, let σ be a degree compatible term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$. Then Algorithm 4 is actually an algorithm and the result*

$$(\mathcal{M}^S, \mathcal{G}^S) := \texttt{quotModuleBB}(\{\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k\}, \{\mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell\}, \sigma)$$

of Algorithm 4 applied to the input data $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k\}$, $\{\mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell\}$, and σ satisfies the following conditions.

i) *The set $\mathcal{M}^S \subseteq P^r/S$ is an order quotient module.*
ii) *The set $\mathcal{G}^S \subseteq P^r/S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of U^S.*

Proof. Let $U = \langle \mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k \rangle + S \subseteq P^r$.

We start to prove that the procedure is actually an algorithm. First, we check that the requirements of the algorithm are satisfied, i. e. if $\operatorname{codim}_K(U, P^r) < \infty$ holds. Since Lemma 6.9 yields that

$$\varepsilon_S^{-1}(U^S) = \langle \mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k \rangle + S = U,$$

we have

$$P^r/U = P^r/\varepsilon_S^{-1}(U^S) \cong \varepsilon_S(P^r)/U^S = (P^r/S)/U^S$$

by the Second Noether Isomorphism Theorem. In particular, we see that

$$\operatorname{codim}_K(U, P^r) = \operatorname{codim}_K(U^S, P^r/S) < \infty,$$

and the requirements of the algorithm are satisfied. Additionally, since we have $U = \langle \mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k, \mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_\ell \rangle$, it follows that line 3 can be computed in a finite amount of time by Theorem 5.3. As all the other steps can obviously be computed in a finite amount of time, we see that the procedure is actually an algorithm.

Next we show the correctness. According to the Module Border Basis Algorithm 5.3, we compute an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \ldots, e_r \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{G} \subseteq P^r$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U in line 3. In particular, $\mathcal{M}^S = \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$, which is computed in line 4, is an order quotient module by Definition 6.1 and $\mathcal{G}^S = \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G})$, which is computed in line 5, is an $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border prebasis by Definition 6.3.

We now prove that $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$. As U is generated by $\mathcal{G}$ according to Corollary 2.17, Lemma 6.9 shows that

$$U^S = \varepsilon_S(U) = \varepsilon_S(\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle) = \langle \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{G}^S \rangle.$$

We write $\mathcal{M} = \{t_1 e_{\alpha_1}, \dots, t_\mu e_{\alpha_\mu}\}$ with $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$, terms $t_1, \dots, t_\mu \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and indices $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\mu \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ be such that

$$t_i e_{\alpha_i} + S = \varepsilon_S(t_i e_{\alpha_i}) = \varepsilon_S(t_j e_{\alpha_j}) = t_j e_{\alpha_j} + S.$$

According to the definition of U and the considerations above, we then have

$$t_i e_{\alpha_i} - t_j e_{\alpha_j} \in S \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K \subseteq U \cap \langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_K.$$

As $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U, Corollary 2.19 yields $t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_j e_{\alpha_j}$. Hence it follows that the restriction $\varepsilon_S|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is injective and thus $\mathcal{M}$ is an order module characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S = \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M})$ by Definition 6.6.

If we show that $\mathcal{G} \subseteq P^r$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S \subseteq P^r/S$, Theorem 6.10 yields that $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of U^S. We write $\partial\mathcal{M} = \{b_1 e_{\beta_1}, \dots, b_\omega e_{\beta_\omega}\}$ with $\omega \in \mathbb{N}$, terms $b_1, \dots, b_\omega \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and indices $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_\omega \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Additionally, we write $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\omega\}$ with

$$\mathcal{G}_j = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i}$$

where $c_{1j}, \dots, c_{\mu j} \in K$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \omega\}$. Let $v, w \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ be such that

$$b_v e_{\beta_v} + S = b_w e_{\beta_w} + S.$$

Then we have

$$b_v e_{\beta_v} - b_w e_{\beta_w} \in S \subseteq U.$$

Since

$$\mathcal{G}_v - \mathcal{G}_w = b_v e_{\beta_v} - b_w e_{\beta_w} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (c_{iv} - c_{iw}) t_i e_{\alpha_i} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle = U,$$

it follows that

$$U = \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (-c_{iv} + c_{iw}) t_i e_{\alpha_i} + U.$$

As $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis of U, this equation yields $c_{iv} = c_{iw}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ by Definition 2.13. Altogether, Definition 6.7 yields that $\mathcal{G}$ is the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S$. In particular, $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S \rangle = U^S$ by Theorem 6.10. □

Example 6.15. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}$, $P = \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$, $\sigma =$ `DegRevLex`, and $\{e_1, e_2\}$ be the canonical P-module basis of P^2. Moreover, we let

$$S = \langle \mathcal{S}_1 \rangle = \langle (x + y + 1, -x + y) \rangle \subseteq P^2$$

and

$$U^S = \langle \mathcal{B}_1 + S, \dots, \mathcal{B}_4 + S \rangle \subseteq P^2/S$$

with

$$\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_4\} = \{(-2, 3x - 1), (3x + 4, 2e_2), (0, y - 1), (y - 1, 0)\}.$$

Like in Example 5.4, we have

$$\operatorname{codim}_K(\langle \mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_4 \rangle + \langle \mathcal{S}_1 \rangle, P^r) = \operatorname{codim}_K(\langle \mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_4, \mathcal{S}_1 \rangle, P^r) < \infty,$$

i. e. the requirements of the Quotient Module Border Bases Algorithm 4 are satisfied.

We now take a closer look at the steps of Algorithm 4 applied to $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_4\}$, $\{\mathcal{S}_1\}$, and σ. We see that the construction of S in line 1 and of ε_S in line 2 coincides with our definitions of S and ε_S. In line 3, we apply the Module Border Basis Algorithm 3 to $\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_4, \mathcal{S}_1\}$ and σ. As we have already seen in Example 5.4, the result of Algorithm 5.3 applied to this input data is the order module

$$\mathcal{M} = \{e_1, e_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^2\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$$

and the $\mathcal{M}$-module border basis $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_4\} \subseteq P^2$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_1 &= xe_1 + \tfrac{4}{3}e_1 + \tfrac{2}{3}e_2, \\
\mathcal{G}_2 &= xe_2 - \tfrac{2}{3}e_1 - \tfrac{1}{3}e_2, \\
\mathcal{G}_3 &= ye_1 - e_1, \\
\mathcal{G}_4 &= ye_2 - e_2
\end{aligned}$$

of $\langle \mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_4, \mathcal{S}_1 \rangle$. Line 4 now yields the order quotient module

$$\mathcal{M}^S = \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{M}) = \{e_1 + S, e_2 + S\} \subseteq P^2/S$$

and the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}^S = \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}) = \{\mathcal{G}_1^S, \dots, \mathcal{G}_4^S\} \subseteq P^2/S$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_1^S &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_1) = xe_1 + \tfrac{4}{3}e_1 + \tfrac{2}{3}e_2 + S, \\
\mathcal{G}_2^S &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_2) = xe_2 - \tfrac{2}{3}e_1 - \tfrac{1}{3}e_2 + S, \\
\mathcal{G}_3^S &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_3) = ye_1 - e_1 + S, \\
\mathcal{G}_4^S &= \varepsilon_S(\mathcal{G}_4) = ye_2 - e_2 + S.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the algorithm returns $(\mathcal{M}^S, \mathcal{G}^S)$ and stops.

According to Corollary 6.14, $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of U^S. Note that this result coincides with Example 6.11

At last, we now derive characterizations of quotient module border bases from Theorem 6.10 and from the characterizations of module border bases in Section 4.

Corollary 6.16. (Quotient Module Border Bases and Special Generation) *Suppose there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r \rangle$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ and let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\omega\} \subseteq P^r$ be the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S$ like in Definition 6.7. Then the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S \rangle$ if and only if $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ and the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.*

A_1) *For every vector $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$, there exist polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_\omega \in P$ such that*

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\omega\mathcal{G}_\omega$$

and

$$\deg(p_j) \leq \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1$$

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, \omega\}$ with $p_j \neq 0$.

A_2) *For every vector $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \setminus \{0\}$, there exist polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_\omega \in P$ such that*

$$\mathcal{V} = p_1\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + p_\omega\mathcal{G}_\omega$$

and

$$\max\{\deg(p_j) \mid j \in \{1,\ldots,\omega\}, p_j \neq 0\} = \operatorname{ind}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V}) - 1.$$

Proof. This corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 6.10. □

Corollary 6.17. (Quotient Module Border Bases and Border Form Modules)
Suppose there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\ldots,e_r\rangle$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ and let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{G}_\omega\} \subseteq P^r$ be the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S$ like in Definition 6.7. Then the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle$ if and only if $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$ and the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.

B_1) *For every $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle \setminus \{0\}$, we have*

$$\operatorname{Supp}(\mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{V})) \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\ldots,e_r\rangle \setminus \mathcal{M}.$$

B_2) *We have*

$$\mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\langle \mathcal{G}\rangle) = \langle \mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{G}_1),\ldots,\mathrm{BF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{G}_\omega)\rangle = \langle b_1 e_{\beta_1},\ldots,b_\omega e_{\beta_\omega}\rangle.$$

Proof. This corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 6.10. □

Corollary 6.18. (Quotient Module Border Bases and Rewrite Rules)
Suppose there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\ldots,e_r\rangle$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ and let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{G}_\omega\} \subseteq P^r$ be the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis characterizing $\mathcal{G}^S$ like in Definition 6.7. Then the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle$ if and only if $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$ and the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.

C_1) *For all $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, we have $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$.*

C_2) *If $\mathcal{V} \in \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$ is irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$, then we have $\mathcal{V} = 0$.*

C_3) *For all $\mathcal{V} \in P^r$, there is a unique vector $\mathcal{W} \in P^r$ such that $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ is irreducible with respect to $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$.*

C_4) *The rewrite relation $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ is confluent.*

Proof. This corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.8 and Theorem 6.10. □

Corollary 6.19. (Quotient Module Border Bases and Commuting Matrices)
Suppose that there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1,\ldots,e_r\rangle$ characterizing $\mathcal{M}^S$ and let $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{G}_\omega\} \subseteq P^r$ be the $\mathcal{M}$-module border prebasis corresponding to $\mathcal{G}^S$ like in Definition 6.7. For all $s \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, we define the map

$$\varrho_s : \{1,\ldots,\mu\} \to \mathbb{N}, \quad i \mapsto \begin{cases} j & \text{if } x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_j e_{\alpha_j} \in \mathcal{M}, \\ k & \text{if } x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_k e_{\beta_k} \in \partial\mathcal{M}. \end{cases}$$

Then the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border prebasis $\mathcal{G}^S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{G}^S\rangle$ if and only if $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G}\rangle$ and the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.

D_1) *The formal multiplication matrices $\mathfrak{X}_1,\ldots,\mathfrak{X}_n \in \operatorname{Mat}_\mu(K)$ of $\mathcal{G}$ are pairwise commuting.*

D_2) *The following equations are satisfied for every $p \in \{1,\ldots,\mu\}$ and for every $s,u \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ with $s \neq u$.*

1) *If* $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = t_j e_{\alpha_j}$, $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_k e_{\beta_k}$, *and* $x_s b_k e_{\beta_k} = b_\ell e_{\beta_\ell}$ *with indices* $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ *and* $k, \ell \in \{1, \dots, \omega\}$, *we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} = c_{p\ell}.$$

2) *If* $x_s t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_j e_{\beta_j}$ *and* $x_u t_i e_{\alpha_i} = b_k e_{\beta_k}$ *with indices* $i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\}$ *and* $j, k \in \{1, \dots, \omega\}$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} + \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_s t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{p\varrho_s(m)} c_{mk} \\ = &\sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \mathcal{M}}} \delta_{p\varrho_u(m)} c_{mj} + \sum_{\substack{m \in \{1,\dots,\mu\} \\ x_u t_m e_{\alpha_m} \in \partial\mathcal{M}}} c_{p\varrho_u(m)} c_{mj}. \end{aligned}$$

If the equivalent conditions are satisfied, for all $s \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, *the formal multiplication matrix* $\mathfrak{X}_s$ *represents the multiplication endomorphism of the* K*-vector space* $(P^r/S)/\langle \mathcal{G}^S \rangle$ *defined by* $\mathcal{V}^S + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \mapsto x_s \mathcal{V}^S + \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$, *where* $\mathcal{V}^S \in P^r/S$, *with respect to the* K*-vector space basis* $\varepsilon_{\langle \mathcal{G}^S \rangle}(\mathcal{M}^S) \subseteq (P^r/S)/\langle \mathcal{G}^S \rangle$.

Proof. This corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.13 and Theorem 6.10. □

Corollary 6.20. (Quotient Module Border Bases and Liftings of Border Syzygies)
Suppose there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r \rangle$ *characterizing* $\mathcal{M}^S$ *and let* $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\omega\} \subseteq P^r$ *be the* $\mathcal{M}$*-module border prebasis characterizing* $\mathcal{G}^S$ *like in Definition 6.7. Then the* $\mathcal{M}^S$*-quotient module border prebasis* $\mathcal{G}^S$ *is the* $\mathcal{M}^S$*-quotient module border basis of* $\langle \mathcal{G}^S \rangle$ *if and only if* $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ *and the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.*

E_1) *Every border syzygy with respect to* $\mathcal{M}$ *lifts to a syzygy of* $(\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\omega)$.
E_2) *Every neighbor syzygy with respect to* $\mathcal{M}$ *lifts to a syzygy of* $(\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\omega)$.

Proof. This corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.20 and Theorem 6.10. □

Corollary 6.21. (Buchberger's Criterion for Quotient Module Border Bases)
Suppose there exists an order module $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n\langle e_1, \dots, e_r \rangle$ *characterizing* $\mathcal{M}^S$ *and let* $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_\omega\} \subseteq P^r$ *be the* $\mathcal{M}$*-module border prebasis characterizing* $\mathcal{G}^S$ *like in Definition 6.7. Then the* $\mathcal{M}^S$*-quotient module border prebasis* $\mathcal{G}^S$ *is the* $\mathcal{M}^S$*-quotient module border basis of* $\langle \mathcal{G}^S \rangle$ *if and only if* $S \subseteq \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ *and the following equivalent conditions are satisfied.*

F_1) *We have* $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = 0$ *for all* $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \omega\}$.
F_2) *We have* $\mathrm{NR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathrm{S}(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)) = 0$ *for all* $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \omega\}$ *such that the border terms* $b_i e_{\beta_i}, b_j e_{\beta_j} \in \partial\mathcal{M}$ *are neighbors with respect to* $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. This corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.22 and Theorem 6.10. □

7. Subideal Border Bases

In this final section, we apply the theory of quotient module border bases introduced in Section 6 to the theory of subideal border bases of zero-dimensional ideals, which have been recently introduced in [KP11]. To this end, we show that every subideal border basis is isomorphic to a quotient module border basis in Proposition 7.3. Using this isomorphy, we can apply all the results of Section 6 to subideal border bases and get the following new results about subideal border bases. We start to deduce an algorithm that computes subideal border bases for an arbitrary zero-dimensional ideal in Corollary 7.4 and that does not need to compute any Gröbner basis. By now, the only way to compute an arbitrary subideal border basis has been given in [KP11, Section 6] and requires the computation of a Gröbner basis. After that, we deduce characterizations of subideal border bases in Remark 7.7 that have not been proven in [KP11]. In particular, this yields an alternative proof of the characterization of subideal border bases via the special generation property, which has already been proven in [KP11, Coro. 3.6], and we get the new characterizations via border form modules, via rewrite rules, via commuting matrices, via liftings of border syzygies, and via Buchberger's Criterion for Subideal Border Bases.

Similar to the previous sections, we fix some notation. We let $J = \langle F \rangle \subseteq P$ be the ideal in P generated by the set $F = \{f_1, \ldots, f_r\} \subseteq P \setminus \{0\}$ where $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall, for every P-module M (respectively K-vector space) and every P-submodule $U \subseteq M$ (respectively K-vector subspace), we let

$$\varepsilon_U : M \twoheadrightarrow M/U, \quad m \mapsto m + U$$

be the canonical P-module epimorphism (K-vector space epimorphism).

We start to recall the definition of an $\mathcal{O}_F$-order ideal, its border, and of an $\mathcal{O}_F$-subideal border basis as introduced in [KP11, Defn. 2.1] and [KP11, Defn. 2.7].

Definition 7.1. Let $\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be order ideals.

a) We call the set

$$\mathcal{O}_F = \mathcal{O}_1 \cdot f_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_r \cdot f_r \subseteq J$$

an F**-order ideal**.

b) Let $\mathcal{O}_F = \mathcal{O}_1 f_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_r f_r \subseteq J$ be an F-order ideal. Then we call the set

$$\partial\mathcal{O}_F = \partial\mathcal{O}_1 \cdot f_1 \cup \cdots \cup \partial\mathcal{O}_r \cdot f_r \subseteq J$$

the **(first) border** of $\mathcal{O}_F$.

Definition 7.2. Let $\mathcal{O}_F = \mathcal{O}_1 f_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_r f_r \subseteq J$ be an F-order ideal where we let $\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$ be finite order ideals. We write $\mathcal{O}_F = \{t_1 f_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu f_{\alpha_\mu}\}$ and $\partial\mathcal{O}_F = \{b_1 f_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu f_{\beta_\nu}\}$ with $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, terms $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$.

a) A set of polynomials $G = \{g_1, \ldots, g_\nu\} \subseteq J$ is called an $\mathcal{O}_F$**-subideal border prebasis** if the polynomials have the form

$$g_j = b_j f_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i f_{\alpha_i}$$

with $c_{ij} \in K$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$.

b) Let $G = \{g_1, \ldots, g_\nu\}$ be an $\mathcal{O}_F$-subideal border prebasis. We call G an $\mathcal{O}_F$**-subideal border basis** of the ideal $I \subseteq P$ if $G \subseteq I$, if the set

$$\varepsilon_{I\cap J}(\mathcal{O}_F) = \{t_1 f_{\alpha_1} + I \cap J, \ldots, t_\mu f_{\alpha_\mu} + I \cap J\}$$

is a K-vector space basis of $J/I \cap J$, and if $\#\varepsilon_{I\cap J}(\mathcal{O}_F) = \mu$.

For the remainder of this section, we always let $\mathcal{O}_F = \mathcal{O}_1 f_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_r f_r$ be an F-order ideal with finite order ideals $\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_r \subseteq \mathbb{T}^n$. Moreover, we write the F-order ideal $\mathcal{O}_F = \{t_1 f_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, t_\mu f_{\alpha_\mu}\}$ and its border $\partial\mathcal{O}_F = \{b_1 f_{\beta_1}, \ldots, b_\nu f_{\beta_\nu}\}$ with $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$, terms $t_i, b_j \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and indices $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$

and $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$. Furthermore, we let $G = \{g_1, \ldots, g_\nu\} \subseteq J$ with polynomials $g_j = b_j f_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i f_{\alpha_i}$ where $c_{ij} \in K$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ be an $\mathcal{O}_F$-subideal border prebasis.

We now prove th central result of this section, namely that every subideal border prebasis is isomorphic as a P-module to a quotient module border prebasis.

Proposition 7.3. *Let $S = \operatorname{Syz}_P(f_1, \ldots, f_r) \subseteq P^r$. Then*

$$\varphi : P^r/S \xrightarrow{\sim} J, \quad e_k + S \mapsto f_k$$

is a P-module isomorphism such that $\varphi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_F) \subseteq P^r/S$ is an order quotient module and $\varphi^{-1}(G) \subseteq P^r/S$ is a $\varphi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_F)$-quotient module border prebasis.

Proof. The two maps

$$\{e_1, \ldots, e_r\} \to P^r, \quad e_k \mapsto e_k$$

and

$$\{e_1, \ldots, e_r\} \to J, \quad e_k \mapsto f_k$$

induce the P-module epimorphism

$$\tilde{\varphi} : P^r \twoheadrightarrow J, \quad e_k \mapsto f_k$$

by the Universal Property of the Free Module. Additionally, we see that $S = \ker(\tilde{\varphi})$ and the Isomorphism Theorem induces the P-module isomorphism

$$\varphi : P^r/S \xrightarrow{\sim} J, \quad e_k + S \mapsto f_k.$$

Moreover,

$$\varphi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_F) = \mathcal{O}_1(e_1 + S) \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_r(e_r + S) \subseteq P^r/S$$

is a quotient order module by Definition 6.1 and

$$\varphi^{-1}(G) = \{\varphi^{-1}(g_1), \ldots, \varphi^{-1}(g_\nu)\} \subseteq P^r/S$$

with

$$\varphi^{-1}(g_j) = b_j e_{\beta_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} c_{ij} t_i e_{\alpha_i} + S$$

for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \nu\}$ is an $\varphi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_F)$-quotient module border prebasis according to Definition 6.3. □

Using the isomorphism constructed in Proposition 7.3, the problem of the computation of subideal border bases is reduced to the problem of the computation of quotient module border bases, which we have already solved in Corollary 6.14. We now deduce an algorithm for the computation of subideal border bases from these results.

Algorithm 5 `subidealBB`$(\{h_1,\dots,h_s\},\{f_1,\dots,f_r\},\sigma)$

```
Require: $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{h_1,\dots,h_s\} \subseteq P \setminus \{0\}$,
    $\operatorname{codim}_K(\langle h_1,\dots,h_s\rangle, P) < \infty$,
    $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{f_1,\dots,f_r\} \subseteq P \setminus \{0\}$,
    $\sigma$ is a degree compatible term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$
 1: $I := \langle h_1,\dots,h_s\rangle$
 2: $J := \langle f_1,\dots,f_r\rangle$
 3: Compute $\{\mathcal{S}_1,\dots,\mathcal{S}_\ell\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\langle \mathcal{S}_1,\dots,\mathcal{S}_\ell\rangle = \operatorname{Syz}_P(f_1,\dots,f_r)$,
    where $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.
 4: $S := \langle \mathcal{S}_1,\dots,\mathcal{S}_\ell\rangle$
 5: Let $\varphi : P^r/S \xrightarrow{\sim} J,\ e_k + S \mapsto f_k$.
 6: Compute $q_{vw} \in P$ for all $v \in \{1,\dots,r\}$ and $w \in \{1,\dots,k\}$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such
    that $I \cap J = \langle \sum_{v=1}^r q_{vw} f_v \mid w \in \{1,\dots,k\}\rangle$.
 7: for $w = 1,\dots,k$ do
 8:     $\mathcal{B}_w := \sum_{v=1}^r q_{vw} e_v$
 9: end for
10: $(\mathcal{M}^S, \mathcal{G}^S) :=$ quotModuleBB$(\{\mathcal{B}_1,\dots,\mathcal{B}_k\},\{\mathcal{S}_1,\dots,\mathcal{S}_\ell\},\sigma)$
11: $\mathcal{O}_F := \varphi(\mathcal{M}^S)$
12: $G := \varphi(\mathcal{G}^S)$
13: return $(\mathcal{O}_F, G)$
```

Corollary 7.4. (Computation of Subideal Border Bases)
Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F = \{f_1,\dots,f_r\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$, and let $J = \langle F\rangle \subseteq P$ be an ideal. Moreover, let $s \in \mathbb{N}$, let $I = \langle h_1,\dots,h_s\rangle \subseteq P$ with $\{h_1,\dots,h_s\} \subseteq P \setminus \{0\}$ be a zero-dimensional ideal, and let σ be a degree compatible term ordering on $\mathbb{T}^n$. Then Algorithm 5 is actually an algorithm and the result

$$(\mathcal{O}_F, G) := \texttt{subidealBB}(\{h_1,\dots,h_s\},\{f_1,\dots,f_r\},\sigma)$$

of Algorithm 5 applied to the input data $\{h_1,\dots,h_s\}$, $\{f_1,\dots,f_r\}$, and σ satisfies the following conditions.

- i) *The set $\mathcal{O}_F \subseteq J$ is an F-order ideal.*
- ii) *The set $G \subseteq J$ is an $\mathcal{O}_F$-subideal border basis of I.*

Proof. We start to prove that the procedure is actually an algorithm. We can compute a generating system $\{\mathcal{S}_1,\dots,\mathcal{S}_\ell\} \subseteq P^r \setminus \{0\}$ with $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ of $\operatorname{Syz}_P(f_1,\dots,f_r)$ in line 3 according to [KR00, Thm. 3.1.8]. Let $S = \langle \mathcal{S}_1,\dots,\mathcal{S}_\ell\rangle$ be like in line 4, and let

$$\varphi : P^r/S \xrightarrow{\sim} J, \quad e_k + S \mapsto f_k$$

be like in line 5. Then we see that S and φ coincide with S and φ in Proposition 7.3. In particular, φ is a P-module isomorphism. We can compute the polynomials $q_{vw} \in P$ for all $v \in \{1,\dots,r\}$ and $w \in \{1,\dots,k\}$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$I \cap J = \left\langle \sum_{v=1}^{r} q_{vw} f_v \;\middle|\; w \in \{1,\dots,k\} \right\rangle$$

as proposed in line 6 according to [KR00, Prop. 3.2.3]. Thus it only remains to prove, that line 10 can be computed. For every $w \in \{1,\dots,k\}$, we let

$$\mathcal{B}_w = \sum_{v=1}^{r} q_{vw} e_v$$

be like in line 8 and we let $U^S = \langle \mathcal{B}_1 + S, \dots, \mathcal{B}_w + S \rangle \subseteq P^r/S$.
If we show that $\operatorname{codim}_K(U^S, P^r/S) < \infty$, then Corollary 6.14 yields that we can compute line 10. The First Noether Isomorphism Theorem yields

$$J/I \cap J \cong I + J/I \subseteq P/I.$$

As φ is an P-module isomorphism, and as we have $\varphi(U^S) = I \cap J$ and $\varphi(P^r/S) = J$ by construction, it follows that

$$\operatorname{codim}_K(U^S, P^r/S) = \operatorname{codim}_K(I \cap J, J) \leq \operatorname{codim}_K(I, P) < \infty.$$

Thus the conditions of Corollary 6.14 are satisfied in line 10. In particular, in line 10, it follows that $\mathcal{M}^S \subseteq P^r/S$ is an order quotient module and that $\mathcal{G}^S \subseteq P^r/S$ is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border bases of U^S. Thus the claim follows with Definition 7.1 and Definition 7.2 since φ is a P-module isomorphism. $\square$

Example 7.5. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $P = \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$.Moreover, let $F = \{f_1, f_2\} \subseteq P \setminus \{0\}$ be with

$$f_1 = x - y, \qquad\qquad f_2 = x + y + 1,$$

let $J = \langle F \rangle$, let

$$I = \langle h_1, h_2 \rangle = \langle x^2 + xy, y - 1 \rangle \subseteq P,$$

and let $\sigma = \texttt{DegRevLex}$. Then we have $x^2, y \in \operatorname{LT}_\sigma(I)$, i. e. $I \subseteq P$ has finite K-codimension in P according to the Finiteness Criterion [KR00, Prop. 3.7.1].

We now take a closer look at the steps of Algorithm 5 applied to $\{h_1, h_2\}$, $\{f_1, f_2\}$, and σ. The definition of I and J above obviously coincide with the definition of I and J in the lines 1–2. In the lines 3–4, we compute the syzygy module

$$S = \operatorname{Syz}_P(f_1, f_2) = \langle \mathcal{S}_1 \rangle = \langle x + y + 1, -x + y \rangle \subseteq P^2$$

with the help of [KR00, Thm. 3.1.8]. Let $\{e_1, e_2\} \subseteq P^2$ be the canonical P-module basis of the free P-module P^2 and let

$$\varphi : P^2/S \xrightarrow{\sim} J, \quad e_k + S \mapsto f_k$$

be like in line 5. Then we use [KR00, Prop. 3.2.3] to compute

$$\begin{aligned} q_{11} &= -2, & q_{12} &= 3x - 1, \\ q_{21} &= 3x + 4, & q_{22} &= 2, \\ q_{31} &= 0, & q_{32} &= y - 1, \\ q_{41} &= y - 1, & q_{42} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

in line 6. Therefore, we have

$$\{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_4\} = \{(-2, 3x - 1), (3x + 4, 2), (0, y - 1), (y - 1, 0)\} \subseteq P^2$$

after the for-loop in line 7.

Note that $\{B_1, \dots, B_4\}$, $\{\mathcal{S}_1\}$, and σ is exactly the input data of Algorithm 4 in Example 6.15. Thus it follows that

$$\mathcal{M}^S = \{e_1 + S, e_2 + S\} \subseteq P^2/S$$

is an order quotient module and $\mathcal{G}^S = \{\mathcal{G}_1^S, \dots, \mathcal{G}_4^S\} \subseteq P^2/S$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_1^S &= xe_1 + \tfrac{4}{3}e_1 + \tfrac{2}{3}e_2 + S, \\ \mathcal{G}_2^S &= xe_2 - \tfrac{2}{3}e_1 - \tfrac{1}{3}e_2 + S, \\ \mathcal{G}_3^S &= ye_1 - e_1 + S, \\ \mathcal{G}_4^S &= ye_2 - e_2 + S. \end{aligned}$$

is the $\mathcal{M}^S$-quotient module border basis of $\langle \mathcal{B}_1 + S, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_4 + S \rangle$ as computed in line 10. Altogether, we compute

$$\mathcal{O}_F = \varphi(\mathcal{M}^S) = \{f_1, f_2\} \subseteq J$$

in line 11 and

$$G = \varphi(\mathcal{G}^S) = \{\varphi(\mathcal{G}_1^S), \ldots, \varphi(\mathcal{G}_4^S)\} \subseteq J$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(\mathcal{G}_1^S) &= x f_1 + \tfrac{4}{3} f_1 + \tfrac{2}{3} f_2,\\
\varphi(\mathcal{G}_2^S) &= x f_2 - \tfrac{2}{3} f_1 - \tfrac{1}{3} f_2,\\
\varphi(\mathcal{G}_3^S) &= y f_1 - f_1,\\
\varphi(\mathcal{G}_4^S) &= y f_2 - f_2
\end{aligned}$$

in line 12.

According to Corollary 7.4, the set $\mathcal{O}_F \subseteq J$ is an F-order ideal and $G \subseteq J$ is an $\mathcal{O}_F$-subideal border basis of I.

As Remark 6.4 has already shown for quotient module border bases, we cannot hope to reuse all results of module border bases in a straightforward for subideal border bases. The following remark explicitly shows some of these problems—using the examples of a $\mathcal{O}_F$-index similar to Definition 2.10 and of a subideal border division algorithm similar to Theorem 2.14—and compares these concepts with the corresponding concepts introduced in [KP11].

Remark 7.6. Using the isomorphism in Proposition 7.3, we can try to define and proof the concepts about module border bases for subideal border bases as described in Remark 6.13. Unfortunately, there are the same problems, e. g. this construction does not yield an $\mathcal{O}_F$-index that is well-defined for any arbitrary polynomial $p \in J$.
But one can also define some of the concepts directly as it has been done in [KP11]. In that paper, many concepts we have seen in Section 2 have directly been introduced for subideal border bases, e. g. an $\mathcal{O}_F$-index, a Subideal Border Division Algorithm, a normal remainder, and a characterization of subideal border bases via the special generation property.
In the author's master's thesis [Kri11], several other characterizations have been proven following the approach of [KP11], e. g. a direct version of characterizations via border form modules, via rewrite rules, via liftings of border syzygies, and via Buchberger's Criterion.

Although we cannot define all the concepts that we introduced in Part 1 for subideal border bases according to Remark 7.6, we can characterize subideal border bases via the isomorphism constructed in Proposition 7.3 the same way we have characterized quotient module border bases in Section 6. In particular, this yields a new proof of the characterization via special generation, which has first been proven in [KP11, Coro. 3.6], and new characterizations via border form modules, via rewrite rules, via commuting matrices, via liftings of border syzygies and via (a weaker version of) Buchberger's Criterion for Subideal Border Bases for Subideal Border Bases.

Remark 7.7. (Characterizations of Subideal Border Bases)
Using the isomorphism in Proposition 7.3, all the characterizations of quotient module border bases in Section 6 immediately yield analogous characterizations of

subideal border bases. In particular, we can characterize subideal border bases via the following properties:

A) special generation, cf. Corollary 6.16,
B) border form modules, cf. Corollary 6.17,
C) rewrite rules, cf. Corollary 6.18,
D) commuting matrices, cf. Corollary 6.19,
E) liftings of border syszygies, cf. Corollary 6.20,
F) Buchberger's Criterion for Subideal Border Bases, cf. Corollary 6.21.

References

[KK05] Achim Kehrein and Martin Kreuzer, **Characterizations of border bases**, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **196** (2005), 251–270.

[KK06] ———, **Computing Border Bases**, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **205** (2006), 279–295.

[KP11] Martin Kreuzer and Henk Poulisse, **Subideal border bases**, Mathematics of Computation **80** (2011), 1135–1154.

[KPR09] Martin Kreuzer, Hennie Poulisse, and Lorenzo Robbiano, **From oil fields to Hilbert schemes**, Approximate Commutative Algebra (John Abbot and Lorenzo Robbiano, eds.), Springer, Vienna, 2009, pp. 1–54.

[KR00] Martin Kreuzer and Lorenzo Robbiano, **Computational Commutative Algebra 1**, Springer, Heidelberg, 2000.

[KR05] ———, **Computational Commutative Algebra 2**, Springer, Heidelberg, 2005.

[Kri11] Markus Kriegl, **Beiträge zur Theorie der Unterideal-Randbasen**, Master's thesis, Universität Passau, 2011, p. 105.

[Mou07] Bernard Mourrain, **Pythagore's dilemma , symbolic-numeric computation, and the border basis method**, Symbolic-Numeric Computation (Dongming Wang and Lihong Zhi, eds.), Birkhäuser, 2007, pp. 223–243.

[MT08] Bernard Mourrain and Philippe Trébuchet, **Stable normal forms for polynomial system solving**, Theoretical Computer Science **409** (2008), 229–240.

[Ste04] Hans J. Stetter, **Numerical polynomial algebra**, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2004.

Fakultät für Informatik und Mathematik, Universität Passau, D-94030 Passau, Germany

E-mail address: `markus.kriegl@uni-passau.de`